

Linear spline index regression model: Interpretability, nonlinearity and dimension reduction

Lianqiang Qu¹, Long Lv¹, Meiling Hao² and Liuquan Sun³

¹*School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central China Normal University,
Wuhan, Hubei, 430079, China*

²*School of Statistics, University of International Business and Economics,
Beijing, 100029, China*

³*Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
and School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences,
Beijing 100190, P.R.China, slq@amt.ac.cn*

Abstract. Inspired by the complexity of certain real-world datasets, this article introduces a novel flexible linear spline index regression model. The model posits piecewise linear effects of an index on the response, with continuous changes occurring at knots. Significantly, it possesses the interpretability of linear models, captures nonlinear effects similar to nonparametric models, and achieves dimension reduction like single-index models. In addition, the locations and number of knots remain unknown, which further enhances the adaptability of the model in practical applications. Combining the penalized approach and convolution techniques, we propose a new method to simultaneously estimate the unknown parameters and the number of knots. The proposed method allows the number of knots to diverge with the sample size. We demonstrate that the proposed estimators can identify the number of knots with a probability approaching one and estimate the coefficients as efficiently as if the number of knots is known in advance. We also introduce a procedure to test the presence of knots. Simulation studies and two real datasets are employed to assess the finite sample performance of the proposed method.

Keywords: Convolution smoothing; Knot detection; Nonlinear effects; Piecewise linear model.

1 Introduction

In the era of information explosion, vast amounts of data have been accumulated across various fields, including economics, medicine, and sociology. In this context, we have access to a real estate valuation dataset that includes two districts in Taipei City and two districts in New Taipei City. The dataset consists of 414 records of real estate transactions, with the variable of interest being the price per unit area of residential housing. In line with the analysis conducted by Yeh and Hsu (2018), we consider the following covariates: the distance to the nearest MRT station (Meter), house age (Year), transaction date (Date), and the number of convenience stores within walking distance in the vicinity (Number).

The aim is to investigate the effects of various covariates on the housing prices. Figure 1 provides insights into the relationship between the housing prices and an index derived from a linear combination of Meter, Year, and Date. The details of what are included in the index are provided in Section 6. The left panel of Figure 1 displays the estimated curve derived from the partial single-index regression model (Wang et al., 2010). Meanwhile, the right panel showcases the fitted curve using the proposed method outlined in Section 2. The results indicate that the effects of the index on housing prices are nonlinear. Specifically, the effects exhibit a significant change but remain continuous up to a certain point (knot). More precisely, housing prices tend to remain stable when the index values are less than the knot. However, once the index values surpass this point, the housing prices experience a rapid increase. Identifying of this knot is crucial, as it facilitates a comprehensive analysis




Figure 1: The analysis of the real estate valuation dataset. The red lines in the left and right panels are the estimated curves via the single-index regression model (Wang et al., 2010) and model (1), respectively. The grey region represents the 95% confidence intervals of the estimates of the knot locations.

of the determinants that influence the stability or rapid escalation in residential property prices.

In summary, for effective analysis of such data, a suitable model should be capable of capturing nonlinear effects of multidimensional covariates, providing a clear interpretation of these effects, mitigating the curse of dimensionality, and accurately determining the locations and number of knots. However, we have not yet identified a model that can simultaneously meet all the desired features. Therefore, developing such a model remains to be an urgent but challenging task.

In this article, we propose a novel linear spline index regression (LSIR) model for data

analysis:

$$Y_i = \gamma_0 + \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta + \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m f(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_m) + Z_i^\top \gamma + \epsilon_i, \quad (1)$$

where Y_i denotes the response variable, $X_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{id_1})^\top$ and $Z_i = (Z_{i1}, \dots, Z_{id_2})^\top$ denote the vectors of covariates, ϵ_i is the random error and $f(x, \tau) = (x - \tau)I(x \geq \tau)$ with $I(\cdot)$ being the indicator function. Here and in what follows, we call $X_i^\top \beta$ an index that aggregates the dimension of X_i . The model allows for changes in slopes at unknown knot locations $-\infty < \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \dots < \tau_{M_n^*} < \infty$, and M_n^* denotes the number of the knots. The slope with respect to the index $X_i^\top \beta$ in the m th segment is denoted by $\mu_m = \sum_{k=0}^m \alpha_k$. The nonzero coefficients $\alpha_m \neq 0$ ($m = 0, 1, \dots, M_n^*$) capture differences in slopes between adjacent m th and $(m + 1)$ th segments. The vectors $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{d_1})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{d_2})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ represent the unknown coefficients for the covariates X_i and Z_i , respectively, and γ_0 denotes the intercept.

The proposed model is appealing since it melds the chief advantages of linear regression models, nonparametric models and single-index models. Specifically, model (1) maintains interpretability similar to linear regression models, where nonzero components of β indicate significant predictors of the response variable. The coefficients $\mu_m \beta_j$ of X_{ij} in the m th segment can be interpreted as the rate of change in the response Y_i associated with a unit increase in X_{ij} , holding all other covariates fixed. In addition, the locations and number of knots are not predetermined but can be data-driven estimated. This feature enhances the flexibility and adaptability of model (1), allowing it to effectively capture the underlying nonlinear effects of multidimensional covariates. Furthermore, model (1) achieves dimension

reduction by collapsing the influence of the covariates X_i into a single-index $X_i^\top \beta$, thus avoiding the curse of dimensionality. In summary, the LSIR model incorporates all the aforementioned desired features.

The proposed method is closely related to two important models: (partial-linear) single-index models and linear spline regression models. Single-index models have been widely used to analyze the nonlinear effects of an index on the response over the last few decades because of their convenient in dimension reduction; see e.g., Powell et al. (1989), Härdle et al. (1993), Carroll et al. (1997), Hristache et al. (2001), Wang et al. (2010), Ma and Zhu (2013) and the references therein. However, single-index models assume that the slopes on the adjacent segments change continuously, therefore they cannot be used for estimating and inferring the locations and number of knots. This distinction sets our model apart from single-index models. In addition, single-index models may lack interpretability within each segment due to the presence of an unknown link function; see the left panel of Figure 1. Linear spline models are alternatively known as kink regression models (Card et al., 2012; Hansen, 2017), bent-line models (Li et al., 2011) and broken-line/stick models (Muggeo, 2003). It is a piecewise linear regression model, where the regression function is continuous but the slope exhibits discontinuities at various knots. This model, with a known number of knots, has been extensively studied in the existing literature (e.g., Tishler and Zang, 1981; Muggeo, 2003; Li et al., 2011; Card et al., 2012; Das et al., 2016; Hansen, 2017; Zhang et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2023). Studies on estimating the number of knots are still limited. Muggeo and Adelfio (2011) proposed utilizing the segmented and Lars algorithms to estimate the

number of knots, while Zhong et al. (2022) developed estimation and inference methods for multi-kink quantile regression and introduced a BIC-type procedure for determining the number of knots. Recently, the multi-kink quantile regression method has been developed in various contexts (Wan et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2024). Nevertheless, current methods primarily focus on incorporating the evolving effects of a single continuous variable, such as time or age, on the response variable, rather than multidimensional covariates. Furthermore, the aforementioned methods assume a fixed number of knots, and are not suitable for situations where the number of knots increases with the sample size. This is exactly the case we are considering in our work.

Hence, the estimation and inference of unknown parameters in the LSIR model present significant challenges that necessitate the development of new techniques, particularly when the number of knots is unknown and can scale with the sample size. The main contributions of our work are outlined as follows.

- We provide a general framework for analyzing the knot effects of multidimensional covariates. The major technical challenges in fitting model (1) include the fact that the objective function is nondifferentiable with respect to τ_m and β , and that the number of knots is unknown. In addition, the presence of an unknown parameter β in the index leads to the scale unknown, which further complicates the identification of the knot locations compared to kink regression models. To tackle these challenges, we develop a new method that combines penalized approaches and convolution techniques to simultaneously estimate the unknown parameters, as well as the locations and number of

knots. Here, the convolution is a local smoothing procedure, which shares the similar spirit of knot estimation in kink regression models (e.g., Tishler and Zang, 1981; Das et al., 2016). However, our method differs from the existing methods in several aspects. Firstly, Das et al. (2016) approximated the non-smoothing function with a quadratic function, which can be regarded as a specific instance of the convolution smoothing approach. In addition, we need a shrinkage procedure for the estimation of the number of knots. This requires a proper decay of the smoothing parameter (bandwidth) in the penalized procedure. Large bandwidths cannot achieve the optimal statistical rate, while small bandwidths are ineffective in the smoothing approximation stage. In contrast to the existing literature, our key observation is that the bandwidth should adapt not only to the sample size but also to the number of knots to strike a balance between the bias and smoothness.

- We establish the consistency and the asymptotic normality for the proposed estimators. Specifically, we thoroughly analyze the size of the number of knots, allowing it to diverge with the sample size. This distinguishes our theoretical analysis from previous studies, such as Zhong et al. (2022), Yang et al. (2023) and Das et al. (2016), which are restricted to finite-knot scenarios. However, it poses challenges in determining the vanishing rate of the bandwidth. To address this issue, we derive an approximate inequality between the smoothed and unsmoothed functions to enhance our theoretical analysis. Combining the penalized method with the approximate inequality, we establish that our estimators can identify M_n^* with probability tending to one, and the

unknown parameters can be estimated as efficiently as when M_n^* is known.

- We develop a test procedure to verify the existence of knots in the LSIR model, and establish its asymptotic distributions under the null and local alternative hypotheses. Our findings demonstrate that the power of the test is affected by both the signal's magnitude and the number of knots. In particular, the power converges to one if there is at least one α_m ($1 \leq m \leq M_n^*$) that diverges with the sample size n , or if the number of knots tends to infinity as n approaches infinity. This advancement in our results surpasses the previous works of Hansen (2017) and Zhong et al. (2022), where the power is only determined by the magnitude of the signal.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the LSIR model and estimation approach. In Section 3, we derive the oracle properties of the proposed estimators. Section 4 introduces a procedure for testing the existence of knots. In Section 5, we report the results of simulation studies conducted to evaluate the performance of the proposed method. Section 6 illustrates the application of our method on two real datasets. Section 7 gives concluding remarks. The technical details are included in the online Supplementary Material.

2 Estimation methods

In this section, we develop an estimation procedure for the parameters presented in model (1). To ensure the identification of α_m , τ_m and β , we assume that the components of X_i are continuously distributed random variables. Furthermore, we assume that the support of X_i

does not lie within any proper linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^{d_1} . In addition, we set the first component β_1 of β to be one. Such identification conditions are commonly required under single-index models (Ichimura, 1993). Then, we write $\beta = (1, \beta_{(-1)}^\top)^\top$ and $X_i = (X_{i1}, \tilde{X}_i^\top)^\top$, where $\beta_{(-1)} = (\beta_2, \dots, \beta_{d_1})^\top$ and $\tilde{X}_i = (X_{i2}, \dots, X_{id_1})^\top$. Let $\tilde{Z}_i = (1, Z_i^\top)^\top$, $\eta = (\gamma_0, \gamma^\top)^\top$, $\alpha(M) = (\alpha_0, \alpha_{(-0)}(M)^\top)^\top$ with $\alpha_{(-0)}(M) = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_M)^\top$ and $\tau(M) = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_M)^\top$. Define $\theta(M) = (\alpha_{(-0)}(M)^\top, \tau(M)^\top, \alpha_0, \beta_{(-1)}^\top, \eta^\top)^\top$. Let the superscript “*” denote the true parameter values under which the data are generated and subscript “o” denote the oracle case, namely the number of knots is known. Define M_n^* as the true number of knots, and write $\theta_o = \theta(M_n^*)$, $\alpha_o^* = \alpha^*(M_n^*)$, $\tau_o^* = \tau^*(M_n^*)$ and $\theta_o^* = \theta^*(M_n^*)$.

The observations consist of n independent and identically distributed samples from model (1), denoted by $\{(X_i, Z_i, Y_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. When M_n^* is known, we can obtain an estimate of θ_o^* using the least squares method, that is,

$$\hat{\theta}_o = \arg \min_{\theta_o} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta - \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta - \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m f(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_m) \right\}^2. \quad (2)$$

We refer to $\hat{\theta}_o$ as the oracle estimator because it is obtained when M_n^* is known. However, there are practical challenges in obtaining $\hat{\theta}_o$. First, it requires M_n^* known in advance, which is often impractical. Second, the function $f(x, \tau)$ is not differentiable at point τ , making the minimization of (2) time-consuming.

To overcome the aforementioned challenges, we develop a novel method to simultaneously estimate θ_o^* and M_n^* , which integrates penalized methods with convolution techniques.




Figure 2: Illustration of the smoothed approximations of the function $f(x, \tau)$. The left panel displays the smoothed functions $q_n(x)$ using the Uniform kernel, Logistic kernel, Gaussian kernel, and Epanechnikov kernel with $\delta_n = 1$ and $\tau = 0$. The right panel showcases the approximation function based on the Uniform kernel for various values of δ_n .

Specifically, we approximate $f(x, \tau)$ by

$$q_n(x, \tau) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(v, \tau) \mathcal{K}_{\delta_n}(v - x) dv, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $\mathcal{K}_{\delta_n}(x) = \delta_n^{-1} \mathcal{K}(x/\delta_n)$ with $\mathcal{K}(x)$ being a kernel function and δ_n being the smoothing parameter. Convolution plays a role of random smoothing in the sense that $q_n(x, \tau) = \mathbb{E}[f(x + Q\delta_n, \tau)]$, where Q denotes a random variable with density function $\mathcal{K}(x)$. To better understand this smoothing mechanism, we compute the smoothed function $q_n(x, \tau)$ explicitly for several widely used kernel functions. In what follows, we write $q_n(x) = q_n(x, 0)$ for short. Please see Figure 2 for a visualization of convolution smoothing methods.

1. (Uniform kernel) Let $\mathcal{K}(x) = (1/2)I(|x| \leq 1)$, which is the density function of the uniform distribution on $[-1, 1]$. Then, we obtain $q_n(x) = (x + \delta_n)^2 I(|x| \leq \delta_n) / (4\delta_n) +$

$xI(x > \delta_n)$, which is exactly the the smoothed function employed to approximate $f(x, \tau)$ in Das et al. (2016).

2. (Epanechnikov kernel) When $\mathcal{K}(x) = (3/4)(1 - x^2)I(|x| \leq 1)$, the resulting smoothed function is $q_n(x) = (-x^4/\delta_n^3 + 6x^2/\delta_n + 8x + 3\delta_n)I(|x| \leq \delta_n)/16 + xI(x > \delta_n)$.
3. (Logistic kernel) In the case of the logistic kernel $\mathcal{K}(x) = e^{-x}/(1 + e^{-x})^2$, the resulting smoothed function is $q_n(x) = \delta_n \ln(1 + e^{x/\delta_n})$, which is the softplus activation function and has been widely used as a smooth activation function in the context of artificial neural networks (Glorot et al., 2011).
4. (Gaussian kernel) Let $\phi(x)$ and $\Phi(x)$ denote the density function and the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution, respectively. When $\mathcal{K}(x) = \phi(x)$, $q_n(x) = x\Phi(x/\delta_n) + \delta_n\phi(x/\delta_n)$.

The parameter δ_n controls the approximation level of $q_n(x, \tau)$, and choosing an appropriate δ_n is vital for accurately estimating unknown parameters. As to the approximation level δ_n , it decreases with n so that the bias of the estimators diminishes to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. However, minimizing (2) becomes time-consuming with a very small δ_n . Thus, there is a trade-off between the bias of estimations and the computational cost. We delve into the decreasing rate of δ_n in more detail in Section 3.

Next, we consider to estimate M_n^* . Intuitively, adding more knots allows for greater flexibility, but it also increases the risk of overfitting the data. However, too few knots can result in an underfitting model that fails to capture the underlying relationships adequately.

Therefore, there exists a balance between model flexibility and complexity. To be more specific, we consider a simple example of model (1):

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_i &= \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta + \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta + \alpha_1 f(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_1) + \alpha_2 f(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_2) + \epsilon_i \\
&= \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta + \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta I(X_i^\top \beta \leq \tau_1) + \{(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1) X_i^\top \beta - \alpha_1 \tau_1\} I(\tau_1 < X_i^\top \beta \leq \tau_2) \\
&\quad + \{(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2) X_i^\top \beta - (\alpha_1 \tau_1 + \alpha_2 \tau_2)\} I(X_i^\top \beta > \tau_2) + \epsilon_i \\
&= \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta + \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta I(X_i^\top \beta \leq \tau_1) + \{(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1) X_i^\top \beta - \alpha_1 \tau_1\} I(X_i^\top \beta > \tau_1) + \epsilon_i, \quad (3)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds if $\alpha_2 = 0$. We see that if τ_2 is not a knot, the slope of $X_i^\top \beta$ on $\tau_1 < X_i^\top \beta \leq \tau_2$ must be the same as that on $X_i^\top \beta > \tau_2$, which implies that $\alpha_2 = 0$. However, if $\alpha_2 = 0$, then τ_2 is unidentifiable. But the last equality in (3) still holds by setting $\tau_2 = \tau_\infty$, where τ_∞ is chosen such that $I(X_i^\top \beta > \tau_\infty) = 0$ almost surely. It is feasible in practice since we can set, for example, $\tau_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |X_i^\top \beta| + 1$. These facts allow us to consider a penalized method to estimate M_n^* . Specifically, let M_n be a prespecified sequence that can diverge with n . We propose the following penalized smoothing least squares method to simultaneously estimate θ_o^* and M_n^* :

$$\hat{\theta}_{\lambda_n} = \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta - \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta - \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} \alpha_m q_n(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_m) \right\}^2 + n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} p_{\lambda_n, t}(|\alpha_m|), \quad (4)$$

where $\theta = \theta(M_n)$ and $\hat{\theta}_{\lambda_n} = (\hat{\alpha}_{(-0), \lambda_n}^\top, \hat{\tau}_{\lambda_n}^\top, \hat{\alpha}_{0, \lambda_n}, \hat{\beta}_{(-1), \lambda_n}^\top, \hat{\eta}_{\lambda_n}^\top)^\top$ with $\hat{\tau}_{m, \lambda_n} = \tau_\infty$ if $\hat{\alpha}_{m, \lambda_n} = 0$. Here, $\hat{\tau}_{m, \lambda_n}$ and $\hat{\alpha}_{m, \lambda_n}$ are the m th component of $\hat{\tau}_{\lambda_n}$ and $\hat{\alpha}_{(-0), \lambda_n}$. In addition, $p_{\lambda_n, t}(u)$ denotes a penalty function, λ_n is a tuning parameter, and t is a parameter that controls the concavity of the penalty function. The magnitude of λ_n controls the complexity of the model. A larger value of λ_n indicates heavier shrinkage for α .

We develop an iterative algorithm to obtain $\widehat{\theta}_{\lambda_n}$. To conserve space, we have provided the detailed information in the Supplementary Material. Let $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{\lambda_n} = \{m : \widehat{\alpha}_{m,\lambda_n} \neq 0, 1 \leq m \leq M_n\}$. Denote $\widehat{M}_{n,\lambda_n} = \text{Card}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{\lambda_n})$ as an estimator of M_n^* , where $\text{Card}(A)$ denotes the cardinality of any set A . In what follows, we omit the dependence of $\widehat{\theta}_{\lambda_n}$, $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{\lambda_n}$ and $\widehat{M}_{n,\lambda_n}$ on the tuning parameter λ_n for the sake of brevity.

In this study, our focus is primarily on the smoothly clipped absolute deviation (SCAD) penalty and the minimax concave penalty (MCP). The SCAD penalty is introduced in Fan and Li (2001) and defined by

$$p_{\lambda_n,t}(u) = \lambda_n \int_0^{|u|} \min \{1, (t - x/\lambda_n)_+ / (t - 1)\} dx, \quad t > 2.$$

The MCP penalty is introduced in Zhang (2010) and defined by

$$p_{\lambda_n,t}(u) = \lambda_n \int_0^{|u|} (1 - x/(t\lambda_n))_+ dx, \quad t > 1.$$

Here, $(x)_+ = \max\{x, 0\}$. Following Fan and Li (2001) and Zhang (2010), we treat t as a fixed constant.

3 Theoretical results

In this section, we establish the consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed estimators. The proofs are given in the Supplementary Material. We consider the following conditions.

Condition 1. *There are M_n^* distinct knots that satisfy $\tau_1^* < \tau_2^* < \dots < \tau_{M_n^*}^*$ and $\mathbb{P}(\tau_m^* < X_i^\top \beta^* \leq \tau_{m+1}^*) > 0$ for $m = 0, \dots, M_n^*$, with $\tau_0^* = -\infty$ and $\tau_{M_n^*+1}^* = \infty$.*

Condition 2. *There exist some positive constants κ_0 and κ_1 such that $|\alpha_m| < \kappa_0$ and $|\sum_{j=0}^m \alpha_j^*| < \kappa_1$ for $0 \leq m \leq M_n^*$. Additionally, $\min_{1 \leq j \leq M_n^*} |\alpha_j^*|/\lambda_n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Condition 3. $\mathbb{E}(X_{ij}^4 | X_i^\top \beta^*) < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}(Z_{ij}^4 | X_i^\top \beta^*) < \infty$.

Condition 4. $\mathbb{E}(\epsilon_i | X_i, Z_i) = 0$, $\mathbb{E}(\epsilon_i^2 | X_i, Z_i) = \sigma^2 < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}(\epsilon_i^4 | X_i, Z_i) < \infty$.

Condition 5. *The kernel function $\mathcal{K}(x)$ has bounded support and satisfies that $\mathcal{K}(x) = \mathcal{K}(-x)$ and $\int \mathcal{K}(x) dx = 1$.*

Condition 6. *(i) $p_{\lambda_n, t}(u)$ is a symmetric function of u , and it is nondecreasing and concave in u for $u \in [0, \infty)$; (ii) $p_{\lambda_n, t}(u)$ is differentiable in $u \in (0, \infty)$ with $\lambda_n^{-1} p'_{\lambda_n, t}(0+) > 0$; and (iii) there exist some positive constants κ_2 and κ_3 such that $|p''_{\lambda_n, t}(u_1) - p''_{\lambda_n, t}(u_2)| \leq \kappa_2 |u_1 - u_2|$ for any u_1 and $u_2 > \kappa_3 \lambda_n$. Here, $p'_{\lambda_n, t}(u)$ and $p''_{\lambda_n, t}(u)$ respectively represent the first and second derivatives of the penalty function $p_{\lambda_n, t}(u)$.*

Condition 7. $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\sqrt{n \lambda_n^2 / s_n} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $s_n = 1 + d_1 + d_2 + 2M_n$.

Condition 1 is mild and assumes that the knots are ordered and distinct. The first part of condition 2 imposes a bound on the slope of $X_i^\top \beta^*$ within each interval $(\tau_m^*, \tau_{m+1}^*]$ for $0 \leq m \leq M_n^*$. This condition is necessary to control the growth of the estimators. The second part of condition 2 places a requirement on the size of the non-zero coefficients α_m^* . It ensures that the non-zero coefficients do not converge to zero too rapidly, which is necessary

for achieving the oracle property. Intuitively, if some non-zero coefficients converge to 0 too fast, it becomes challenging to estimate them accurately. This condition relaxes the requirement in Das et al. (2016), where $|\alpha_m^*|$ is bounded below by a constant independent of the sample size n for $0 \leq m \leq M_n^*$. Conditions 3 and 4 are standard assumptions in linear regression models.

Condition 5 specifies that $\mathcal{K}(x)$ is a symmetric density function, and is satisfied by many kernel functions, such as the uniform kernel and the Epanechnikov kernel. Under condition 5, the convolution gives a smooth approximation to the function $f(x, \tau)$. To see this, we define the support of $\mathcal{K}(x)$ as $[-1, 1]$ and set $\tau = 0$. A direct calculation yields $q_n(x) = \int_{-1}^{x/\delta_n} (x - u\delta_n)\mathcal{K}(u)du$ if $|x| \leq \delta_n$ and $q_n(x) = f(x, 0)$ otherwise. Moreover, $q'_n(x) = \int_{-1}^{x/\delta_n} \mathcal{K}(u)du$ and $q''_n(x) = \mathcal{K}(x/\delta_n)/\delta_n$. These imply that $q_n(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous, that is, $|q_n(x_1) - q_n(x_2)| \leq |x_1 - x_2|$ for any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, it can be shown that $|q_n(x) - f(x, 0)| \leq O(\delta_n)$. Therefore, a smaller bandwidth results in a more accurate approximation between $q_n(x)$ and $f(x, 0)$. This approximate inequality is crucial for our theoretical analysis. Note that in condition 5, we assume the boundedness of the support of $\mathcal{K}(x)$, which is primarily made to simplify the proof of subsequent theorems.

Condition 6 describes the properties of a folded-concave penalty function (Fan and Peng, 2004). It consists of three parts. The first part states that the penalty function is symmetric, non-decreasing, and concave in its argument. The second part requires differentiability of the penalty function with a positive derivative at zero. This condition ensures that the penalty function is singular at the origin, leading to sparsity in the estimated coefficients. The third

part imposes a smoothness condition on the penalty function, controlling the change rate of its second derivative. Many popular folded-concave penalty functions, such as SCAD and MCP, satisfy condition 6.

Condition 7 is a mild condition that determines the vanishing rate of the tuning parameter λ_n . These conditions collectively ensure the consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed estimators, providing theoretical guarantees for their performance as the sample size increases.

Let $a_n = \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n} \{p'_{\lambda_n, t}(|\alpha_m^*|) : \alpha_m^* \neq 0\}$ and $b_n = \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n} \{p''_{\lambda_n, t}(|\alpha_m^*|) : \alpha_m^* \neq 0\}$. Define $\mathcal{S}^* = \{m : \alpha_m^* \neq 0, 1 \leq m \leq M_n\}$. The following theorem establishes the existence and consistency of the penalized smoothing least squares estimator.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that conditions 1-7 hold. If $b_n \rightarrow 0$, $\sqrt{n}s_n^2\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $s_n^3/(n\delta_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then there exists a local minimizer $\widehat{\theta}$ defined in (4) such that*

$$(i) \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S}^*) \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

$$(ii) \|\widehat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\| = O_p(s_n^{1/2}(n^{-1/2} + a_n)), \text{ where } \widehat{\theta}_1 = (\widehat{\alpha}_{(-0)}(M_n^*)^\top, \widehat{\tau}(M_n^*)^\top, \widehat{\alpha}_0, \widehat{\beta}_{(-1)}^\top, \widehat{\eta}^\top)^\top$$

is the subvector of $\widehat{\theta}$, and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm.

The first part of Theorem 1 states that the proposed estimators can identify the true model with probability tending to one. It also implies that \widehat{M}_n is a consistent estimator of M_n^* . The second part demonstrates that if a_n is of order $n^{-1/2}$, then there exists a root- (n/s_n) -consistent estimator of θ^* . If the penalty function is SCAD or MCP and condition 2 holds, then $a_n = 0$ when n is sufficiently large. This implies that the scaling factor becomes

negligible as the sample size increases, indicating that the proposed estimators achieves the optimal convergence rate.

Theorem 1 requires $\sqrt{n}s_n^2\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $s_n^3/(n\delta_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. If d_1 and d_2 are fixed, then we have $s_n = O(M_n)$. Therefore, it implies that the number of knots M_n can increase with the sample size, but the increase rate can not be too fast in order to ensure the optimal convergence rate. Moreover, the condition $\sqrt{n}s_n^2\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ indicates that a small δ_n is needed to ensure that the bias of the estimators becomes negligible as s_n increases. In contrast, $s_n^3/(n\delta_n) \rightarrow 0$ indicates that a large δ_n is necessary for maintaining the smoothness of the loss function. It further indicates that the smoothing parameter $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ should adapt to the sample size and the number of knots to achieve a balanced trade-off between the bias and smoothness. Intuitively, a large value of M_n tends to make the locations τ_m and τ_{m+1} of knots close to each other. Therefore, a slightly smaller value of δ_n may be more popular in order to better distinguish these knots. This finding is different from the results of Das et al. (2016), where δ_n is free of the number of knots.

Next, we establish the normality of the proposed estimator. Define

$$\Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\theta_o) = \text{diag}\{p''_{\lambda_n,t}(|\alpha_1|), \dots, p''_{\lambda_n,t}(|\alpha_{M_n^*}|), 0, \dots, 0\},$$

$$B(\theta_o) = (p'_{\lambda_n,t}(|\alpha_1|)\text{sgn}(\alpha_1), \dots, p'_{\lambda_n,t}(|\alpha_{M_n^*}|)\text{sgn}(\alpha_{M_n^*}), 0, \dots, 0)^\top,$$

$$\text{and } V(\theta_o) = \mathbb{E}\{H_i(\theta_o)H_i(\theta_o)^\top\},$$

where

$$H_i(\theta_o) = \left(f(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_1), \dots, f(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_{M_n^*}), -\alpha_1 I(X_i^\top \beta > \tau_1), \dots, -\alpha_{M_n^*} I(X_i^\top \beta > \tau_{M_n^*}), \right. \\ \left. X_i^\top \beta, \left[\alpha_0 + \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m I(X_i^\top \beta > \tau_m) \right] \tilde{X}_i^\top, \tilde{Z}_i^\top \right)^\top.$$

Furthermore, we write $\Sigma_{\lambda_n}^* = \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\theta_o^*)$, $B^* = B(\theta_o^*)$ and $V_* = V(\theta_o^*)$ for short.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that conditions 1-7 hold. If $\sqrt{ns_n^5} \delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $s_n^4/(n\delta_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then for any $q \times s_n^*$ matrix A_n , we have*

$$\sqrt{n} A_n V_*^{-1/2} (V_* + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}^*) \{ \hat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^* + (V_* + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}^*)^{-1} B^* \} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_q, \sigma^2 G),$$

where \xrightarrow{d} means convergence in distribution, and G is a $q \times q$ positive definite matrix such that $A_n A_n^\top \rightarrow G$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, with $\|G\|_F = O(1)$. Here, $s_n^* = 1 + d_1 + d_2 + 2M_n^*$, $q < s_n^*$ is fixed, and $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm of a matrix.

For the SCAD and MCP, $\Sigma_{\lambda_n}^*$ and B^* become zero with a sufficiently large n . Theorem 2 can be simplified to state that $\sqrt{n} A_n V_*^{1/2} (\hat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0_q, \sigma^2 G)$, which has the same efficiency as the estimator $\hat{\theta}_o$ based on M_n^* known in advance. In this sense, our estimator achieves the oracle property.

In practice, the covariance matrix of $\hat{\theta}_1$ needs to be estimated. Following the conventional technique, we consider the following sandwich formula to estimate the covariance of $\hat{\theta}_1$:

$$\hat{\Xi}_n = n^{-1} \hat{\sigma}^2 \{ V_n(\hat{\theta}_1) + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\hat{\theta}_1) \}^{-1} V_n(\hat{\theta}_1) \{ V_n(\hat{\theta}_1) + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\hat{\theta}_1) \}^{-1},$$

where

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \hat{\eta} - \hat{\alpha}_0 X_i^\top \hat{\beta} - \sum_{m=1}^{\hat{M}_n} \hat{\alpha}_m q_n(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}, \hat{\tau}_m) \right\}^2,$$

and $V_n(\hat{\theta}_1) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n H_{ni}(\hat{\theta}_1) H_{ni}(\hat{\theta}_1)^\top$ with

$$H_{ni}(\hat{\theta}_1) = \left(q_n(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}, \hat{\tau}_1), \dots, q_n(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}, \hat{\tau}_{\widehat{M}_n}), \hat{\alpha}_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_1} q_n(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}, \hat{\tau}_1), \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{\widehat{M}_n} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{\widehat{M}_n}} q_n(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}, \hat{\tau}_{\widehat{M}_n}), \right. \\ \left. X_i^\top \hat{\beta}, \left[\hat{\alpha}_0 \tilde{X}_i + \sum_{m=1}^{\widehat{M}_n} \hat{\alpha}_m \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_{(-1)}} q_n(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}, \hat{\tau}_m) \right]^\top, \tilde{Z}_i^\top \right)^\top.$$

The following theorem establishes the consistency of the sandwich-type estimator.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that conditions 1-7 hold. If $\sqrt{ns_n^5} \delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $s_n^4 / (n\delta_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then we have*

$$n[A_n \widehat{\Xi}_n A_n^\top - A_n \Xi A_n^\top] = o_p(1),$$

where A_n is defined in Theorem 2, and $\Xi = n^{-1} \sigma^2 (V_* + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}^*)^{-1} V_* (V_* + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}^*)^{-1}$.

The consistent result offers a way to construct a confidence interval for the estimates of parameters. For example, let $e_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\widehat{M}_n}$ be a row vector with one in the j th component and zero otherwise, and set $A_n = e_j \{V_n(\hat{\theta}_1) + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\hat{\theta}_1)\}^{-1} V_n(\hat{\theta}_1)^{1/2} / \hat{\sigma}$ with $q = 1$. Then, we can construct a confidence interval with level ς for θ_{oj}^* by $[\hat{\theta}_{1j} - z_{\varsigma/2} \sqrt{e_j \widehat{\Xi}_n e_j^\top}, \hat{\theta}_{1j} + z_{\varsigma/2} \sqrt{e_j \widehat{\Xi}_n e_j^\top}]$, where θ_{oj}^* and $\hat{\theta}_{1j}$ are the j th components of θ_o^* and $\hat{\theta}_1$, respectively, and $z_{\varsigma/2}$ denotes the upper $\varsigma/2$ -quantile of the standard normal distribution. In addition, it allows for simultaneous testing of whether a group of variables are significant by using a specific matrix A_n . For example, consider the following hypothesis:

$$H_0 : \beta_{(-1)}^* = 0 \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_1 : \beta_{(-1)}^* \neq 0.$$

If the null hypothesis holds, then model (1) reduces to linear spline regression models (Card et al., 2012; Hansen, 2017; Li et al., 2011; Muggeo, 2003). Hence, it is interesting to test

whether $\beta_{(-1)}^*$ is zero. To aim this, we set $A_n = e_\beta \{V_n(\hat{\theta}_1) + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\hat{\theta}_1)\}^{-1} V_n(\hat{\theta}_1)^{1/2} / \hat{\sigma}$ with $q = d_1 - 1$, where $e_\beta = (e_{2(1+\widehat{M}_n)}^\top, \dots, e_{1+d_1+2\widehat{M}_n}^\top)^\top$. For this, we define the following statistic

$$\mathcal{W} = \widehat{\beta}_{(-1)}^\top [e_\beta \widehat{\Xi} e_\beta^\top]^{-1} \widehat{\beta}_{(-1)}.$$

By Theorems 2 and 3, we can show that $\mathcal{W} \xrightarrow{d} \chi^2(d_1 - 1)$, where $\chi^2(m)$ denotes a Chi-square distribution with m degrees of freedom.

4 Testing for knot effects

In this section, we investigate the presence or existence of knots. To this end, we focus on examining the following hypotheses:

$$H_0 : \alpha_1^* = \dots = \alpha_{M_n^*}^* = 0 \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_1 : \alpha_m^* \neq 0 \text{ for some } m \in \{1, \dots, M_n^*\}.$$

If the null hypothesis H_0 holds, then the LSIR model is identical to the traditional linear regression model, without any knots. Conversely, there exists at least one knot in the LSIR model under the alternative hypothesis H_1 . Define

$$\psi(\tau_0, \alpha_0, \beta, \eta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n q_n(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_0) (Y_i - \widetilde{Z}_i^\top \eta - \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta).$$

Under H_0 , τ_m^* vanishes and becomes unidentified. But it still holds that $\mathbb{E}\{\psi(\tau_0, \alpha_0^*, \beta^*, \eta^*)\} = 0$ for any given τ_0 . This implies that the value of $\psi(\tau_0, \alpha_0^*, \beta^*, \eta^*)$ is close to zero under H_0 . Additionally, we have $\mathbb{E}\{\psi(\tau_0, \alpha_0^*, \beta^*, \eta^*)\} \neq 0$ for some τ_0 under H_1 . To address the unidentifiable issue of τ_0 , we consider a supremum-type test statistic for the hypothesis:

$$\mathcal{T} = \sup_{\tau_0 \in \widehat{\Theta}_\tau} \frac{\{n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\psi}_i(\tau_0)\}^2}{\widehat{\varrho}(\tau_0)},$$

where $\Theta_\tau \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a compact set, $\widehat{\psi}_i(\tau_0) = q_n(X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}, \tau_0)(Y_i - \widetilde{Z}_i^\top \widehat{\eta} - \widehat{\alpha}_0 X_i^\top \widehat{\beta})$, $\widehat{\varrho}(\tau_0)$ is a consistent estimator for the asymptotic variance of $\psi(\tau_0, \widehat{\alpha}_0, \widehat{\beta}, \widehat{\eta})$ under H_0 , and $\widehat{\alpha}_0$, $\widehat{\beta}$ and $\widehat{\eta}$ are the estimates of α_0^* , β^* and η^* under H_0 . Specifically, $\widehat{\alpha}_0$, $\widehat{\beta}$ and $\widehat{\eta}$ can be obtained by

$$(\widehat{\alpha}_0, \widehat{\beta}^\top, \widehat{\eta}^\top)^\top = \arg \min_{(\alpha_0, \beta^\top, \eta^\top)^\top} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(Y_i - \widetilde{Z}_i^\top \eta - \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta \right)^2. \quad (5)$$

Define $\Psi(\varsigma) = I(\mathcal{T} > c(\varsigma))$, where $c(\varsigma)$ is the critical value and ς denotes the significant level. The test statistic \mathcal{T} is close to zero under H_0 . Therefore, we reject H_0 if and only if $\Psi(\varsigma) = 1$. Taking another perspective on the test statistic $\psi(\tau_0, \alpha_0, \beta, \eta)$ is that $\psi(\tau_m^*, \alpha_0^*, \beta^*, \eta^*)$ is a smoothing score function for α_m^* evaluated at $\alpha_1^* = \dots = \alpha_{M_n^*}^* = 0$. Thus, $\psi(\tau_m^*, \alpha_0^*, \beta^*, \eta^*)$ can be viewed as a score-type test statistic for the hypothesis. Such type test statistics are also considered in different literature (e.g., Andrews, 2001; Fan et al., 2017; Zhong et al., 2022).

To analyze the asymptotic behaviour of the test statistic \mathcal{T} , we introduce a sequence of local alternatives denoted as H_{1n} , where we assume that $\alpha_m^* = \varpi_m/n^{1/2}$ for some $m \in \{1, \dots, M_n^*\}$. This means that under H_{1n} , there exists at least one knot, and the underlying signals are decreasing at a rate of $n^{-1/2}$.

We define $D(\tau_0) = \mathbb{E}\{\xi_i f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0)\}$, $\psi_{*i}(\tau_0) = \{f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0) - D(\tau_0)^\top \Omega^{-1} \xi_i\}(Y_i - \widetilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^*)$, and $\varrho(\tau_0) = \mathbb{E}\{\psi_{*i}(\tau_0)^2\}$, where $\xi_i = (X_i^\top \beta^*, \alpha_0^* \widetilde{X}_i^\top, \widetilde{Z}_i^\top)^\top$ and $\Omega = \mathbb{E}(\xi_i \xi_i^\top)$.

Theorem 4. *Suppose that conditions 1-5 hold. If $\sqrt{n}\delta_n^2 \rightarrow 0$, $n\delta_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $s_n^2/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then, under either the null hypothesis H_0 or the local alternative H_{1n} , we have that \mathcal{T} converges in distribution to $\sup_{\tau_0 \in \Theta_\tau} \mathcal{G}(\tau_0)^2$, where $\{\mathcal{G}(\tau_0) : \tau_0 \in \Theta_\tau\}$ is a Gaussian process*

with mean function $\Delta(\tau_0) = \mathbb{E}[\{f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0) - D(\tau_0)^\top \Omega^{-1} \xi_i\} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \varpi_m f(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_m^*)] / \sqrt{\varrho(\tau_0)}$ and covariance function $\Gamma(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \mathbb{C}\text{OV}(\psi_{*i}(\tau_1), \psi_{*i}(\tau_2)) / \sqrt{\varrho(\tau_1)\varrho(\tau_2)}$ for any given $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \Theta_\tau$.

Theorem 4 states that under the null hypothesis, $\Psi(\varsigma)$ can achieve a level of significance of ς . Meanwhile, Theorem 4 also indicates that the power of the proposed test statistic is essentially controlled by the signal-to-noise ratio term $\Delta(\tau_0)$. When all ϖ_m ($1 \leq m \leq M_n^*$) in $\Delta(\tau_0)$ converge to zero, the power diminishes to ς . In this case, the proposed test can not distinguish the null hypothesis from the local alternatives. If there exists at least one ϖ_m in $\Delta(\tau_0)$ diverging with n or $M_n^* \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the power converges to 1, which implies that the proposed method is consistent.

In practice, the critical value $c(\varsigma)$ can be obtained using a resampling approach. For this purpose, we define $\hat{\psi}_{*i}(\tau_0) = \{f(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}, \tau_0) - \hat{D}(\tau_0)^\top \hat{\Omega}^{-1} \hat{\xi}_i\} (Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \hat{\eta} - \hat{\alpha}_0 X_i^\top \hat{\beta})$, where $\hat{D}(\tau_0) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\xi}_i f(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}, \tau_0)$, $\hat{\Omega} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\xi}_i \hat{\xi}_i^\top$, and $\hat{\xi}_i = (X_i^\top \hat{\beta}, \hat{\alpha}_0 X_i^\top, \tilde{Z}_i^\top)^\top$. Let $\hat{\varrho}(\tau_0) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\psi}_{*i}(\tau_0)^2$. Then, define

$$\mathcal{T}^* = \sup_{\tau_0 \in \Theta_\tau} \frac{\{n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{G}_i \hat{\psi}_{*i}(\tau_0)\}^2}{\hat{\varrho}(\tau_0)},$$

where \tilde{G}_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) are independent standard normal variables which are independent of the observed data. By repeatedly generating normal random samples \tilde{G}_i , the distribution of \mathcal{T} can be approximated by the conditional distribution of \mathcal{T}^* given the observed data. Then, the critical value $c(\varsigma)$ can be obtained from the upper $(1 - \varsigma)$ -percentile of the conditional distributions of \mathcal{T}^* .

5 Simulation studies

In this section, we conduct simulation studies to evaluate the finite sample performance of the proposed estimators. To select the tuning parameter λ_n , we employ a Bayesian information criterion (BIC):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BIC}(\lambda_n) = & \log \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \hat{\eta} - \hat{\alpha}_0 X_i^\top \hat{\beta} - \sum_{m=1}^{\hat{M}_n} \hat{\alpha}_m f(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}, \hat{\tau}_m) \right\}^2 \right] \\ & + (2\hat{M}_n + 2 + d_1 + d_2) \times \frac{C_n \log(n)}{2n}, \end{aligned}$$

where C_n is a predetermined constant. When $C_n = 1$, it reduces to the traditional BIC. When $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$, it corresponds to the modified BIC. The modified BIC has been shown by Wang et al. (2009) to consistently identify the true model, when the dimension of the unknown parameters diverges with the sample size n .

5.1 Consistency and normality

We generate the covariates X_i and Z_{i1} ($i = 1, \dots, n$) as follows. First, we generate $\check{X}_i = (\check{X}_{i1}, \check{X}_{i2}, \check{X}_{i3})^\top$ independently from a multivariate normal distribution with mean zero and covariance $\Upsilon = (\sigma_{sk} : 1 \leq s, k \leq 3)$. We set $\sigma_{ss} = 1$ and $\sigma_{sk} = 0.5$ for $s \neq k$. Then we define $X_{i1} = \check{X}_{i1}$, $X_{i2} = 3.5\{2\Phi(\check{X}_{i2}) - 1\}$, and $Z_{i1} = \check{X}_{i3}$. The random errors ϵ_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) are independently generated from three different distributions: the standard normal distribution ($\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$), a standardized Chi-square distribution with 2 degrees of freedom ($\text{Schi}^2(2)$), and a Student's t -distribution with 4 degrees of freedom ($t(4)$). The standardized Chi-square

distribution is skewed but still has a zero mean, while the $t(4)$ distribution represents moderately heavy-tailed errors. We set $\gamma_1^* = 0.5$, and the responses Y_i are then generated under the following three cases:

Case 1: $Y_i = Z_{i1}\gamma_1^* + \alpha_0^*X_i^\top\beta^* + \alpha_1^*f(X_i^\top\beta^*, \tau_1^*) + \epsilon_i$, where $\beta^* = (1, -1)^\top$, $\tau_1^* = 0$, and $\alpha^* = (-1, 1.5)^\top$.

Case 2: $Y_i = Z_{i1}\gamma_1^* + \alpha_0^*X_i^\top\beta^* + \sum_{m=1}^2 \alpha_m^*f(X_i^\top\beta^*, \tau_m^*) + \epsilon_i$, where $\beta^* = (1, -1)^\top$, $\tau^* = (-1, 1)^\top$, and $\alpha^* = (1, -2, 2)^\top$.

Case 3: $Y_i = Z_{i1}\gamma_1^* + \alpha_0^*X_i^\top\beta^* + \sum_{m=1}^4 \alpha_m^*f(X_i^\top\beta^*, \tau_m^*) + \epsilon_i$, where $\beta^* = (1, -2)^\top$, $\tau^* = (-4, -2, 2, 4)^\top$, and $\alpha^* = (-1, 3, -2, -2, 3)^\top$.

Under Cases 1-3, we vary $M_n^* \in \{1, 2, 4\}$, $n \in \{1000, 2000\}$ and present different curves of $\varphi(w) = \alpha_0^*w + \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^*f(w, \tau_m^*)$ in Figure S1. Considering both the theoretical rate and common practice, we set $M_n = 5$ at the order of $n^{1/15}$. Let $\delta_n = \{\log(M_n)/n\}^\nu$ with ν varying in 0.6 and 0.8, and $\tau_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |X_i \widehat{\beta}^{(k)}| + 1$. For the penalty function, we consider MCP with $t = 3$ and SCAD with $t = 3.7$, and set C_n to be 1 or $\log\{\log(n)\}$ in BIC. All the reported results are based on 1000 replications.

We begin by evaluating the consistency of \widehat{M}_n . Table 1 reports the percentage of correctly specified models (i.e. $\widehat{M}_n = M_n^*$). It can be observed that all the percentages are close to 1 and increase as the sample size n varies from 1000 to 2000. These results validate the selection consistency in Theorem 1. Furthermore, the performance of the proposed procedure with $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ outperforms that with $C_n = 1$. Additionally, the results

remain comparable when the value of ν varies from 0.6 to 0.8. This indicates that the selection consistency is stable with respect to a proper choice of ν .

We proceed to evaluate the consistency and normality of $\hat{\theta}$. We fix $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$. The simulation results are summarized in Tables 2-4 and S1-S10 in the Supplementary Material. These tables provide information on various performance measures of $\hat{\theta}$. Specifically, the tables include the bias (Bias), which is given by the sample mean of the estimate minus the true value. The sample standard deviation (SD) are also provided to assess the variability of $\hat{\theta}$. Additionally, the sample mean of the standard error (SE) estimate is reported. Finally, the 95% empirical coverage probability (CP) based on the normal approximation is calculated to evaluate the accuracy of the confidence intervals. For comparison, we also carry out the oracle procedure, denoted as $\hat{\theta}_o$. This procedure involves minimizing (2) with M_n^* known.

The results indicate that our proposed method performed well for the situations considered. Specifically, the proposed estimators are practically unbiased. The estimated standard errors are very close to the sample standard deviations, and decrease as n varies from 1000 to 2000. The 95% empirical coverage probabilities are also reasonable, suggesting that the proposed confidence intervals have good coverage properties. Importantly, the performance of the proposed estimators is comparable to that of the oracle estimators. These results demonstrate the validity of Theorems 1 and 2. Moreover, the results are comparable with ν varying from 0.6 to 0.8, indicating that the consistency and normality of $\hat{\theta}$ are stable to a proper choice of ν .

5.2 Power analysis

We conduct simulation studies to evaluate the power performance of the test for detecting the existence of knots. We set $\beta^* = (1, -1)^\top$ and $\gamma_1^* = 0.5$. The covariates X_i and Z_{i1} are generated as in Section 5.1. We considered two cases for generating Y_i :

Case 4: $Y_i = Z_{i1}\gamma_1^* + \alpha_0^*X_i^\top\beta^* + \alpha_1^*f(X_i^\top\beta^*, \tau_1^*) + \epsilon_i$, where $\tau_1^* = 0$, $\alpha_0^* = 1$ and $\alpha_1^* = \tilde{\alpha}$.

Case 5: $Y_i = Z_{i1}\gamma_1^* + \alpha_0^*X_i^\top\beta^* + \sum_{m=1}^2 \alpha_m^*f(X_i^\top\beta^*, \tau_m^*) + \epsilon_i$, where $\tau^* = (-1, 1)^\top$, $\alpha_0^* = 1$ and $\alpha_1^* = \alpha_2^* = \tilde{\alpha}$.

Under these settings, the number of knots is $M_n^* = 1$ for Case 4 and $M_n^* = 2$ for Case 5. We vary $\tilde{\alpha} \in \{0, 0.05, 0.1, 0.15, 0.2, 0.25\}$, where $\tilde{\alpha} = 0$ corresponds to the null hypothesis. The departure from H_0 increases as $\tilde{\alpha}$ varies from 0.05 to 0.25. When calculating the test statistic \mathcal{T} , we take the grid of 100 evenly spaced points in $\Theta_\tau = [-2.5, 2.5]$. We vary $\nu \in \{0.6, 0.7, 0.8\}$. The significance level is set to be $\zeta = 0.05$, and the sample size is set to be $n = 500$ and $n = 1000$. The critical value is calculated using the resampling method with 1000 simulated realizations. The empirical sizes and powers of the test, based on 1000 replications, are summarized in Table 5. Under the null hypothesis ($\tilde{\alpha} = 0$), the empirical sizes are close to the nominal significance level of 5%. The empirical sizes are comparable for different values of ν , demonstrating the validity and robustness of the proposed test statistics to detect knots. The empirical powers increase as the sample size n or the magnitude of the knot effect $\tilde{\alpha}$ increases. When $\tilde{\alpha}$ increases to 0.25, the powers are almost 100% for all settings. As expected, the powers are higher when $M_n^* = 2$ compared to $M_n^* = 1$.

6 Real data analysis

In this section, we analyze two real datasets to validate the performance of the proposed method.

6.1 Real estate valuation dataset

In Example 1, the dataset consists of 414 real estate transaction records during the period of June 2012 to May 2013, collected from two districts in Taipei City and two districts in New Taipei City. The response variable is the residential housing price per unit area. The goal of the analysis is to investigate the knot effects of various variables on housing prices. Based on related research in Yeh and Hsu (2018), four covariates are considered: the distance to the nearest MRT station (Meter), house age (Year), transaction date (Date), and the number of convenience stores in the living circle on foot (Number). The raw data is available at <https://archive.ics.uci.edu>.

The analysis begins by attempting several choices of X_{ij} as potential knot variables, but none of them yield better results in terms of goodness-of-fit R^2 , compared to using the Number variable as Z_{i1} , the negative Meter variable as X_{i1} , the Year variable as X_{i2} , and the Date variable as X_{i3} . Here, $R^2 = 1 - \text{SSE}/\text{SST}$, $\text{SST} = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2$, $\text{SSE} = \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{Y}_i - Y_i)^2$ and \hat{Y}_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) are the fitted values of Y_i using model (1). The testing procedure described in Section 4 is performed to examine the existence of knots. The resulting p-value

is less than 0.001, which indicates the presence of at least one knot. The parameters in model (1) are then estimated using the proposed method. For this purpose, as in the simulation studies, we set $M_n = 5$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\delta_n = \{\log(M_n)/n\}^{0.8}$. The estimated results are provided in Table 6, and the estimated number of knots is $\widehat{M}_n = 1$. Figure 1 displays a scatter plot between the estimated index $X_i^\top \widehat{\beta}$ and the residential housing price per unit area, along with the fitted LSIR curve.

The estimated location of knot is -0.25 with p-value less than 0.05. In addition, $\widehat{\alpha}_0 = 2.99$ and $\widehat{\alpha}_1 = 16.7$ with p-value less than 0.05. This indicates that the housing prices have a slow increase with the index in the interval $(-\infty, -0.25]$, but increase quickly with a rate of $\widehat{\mu}_1 = \widehat{\alpha}_0 + \widehat{\alpha}_1 = 19.69$ when the index exceed -0.25 . Finally, it is observed that the house age has a significant negative effect on housing prices, while the transaction date and the number of convenience stores have positive effects.

6.2 Fish toxicity dataset

In Example 2, we have obtained a fish toxicity dataset sourced from a study on predicting acute toxicity of chemicals towards the fathead minnow (Cassotti et al., 2015). The dataset consists of 908 samples, where each sample represents a different chemical. The response variable is LC50, which is the concentration that causes death in 50% of test fathead minnows over a test duration of 96 hours. In line with the research conducted by Cassotti et al. (2015), the focus is on six specific molecular descriptors: CIC0 (information indices), SM1_Dz(Z) (2D matrix-based descriptors), MLOGP (molecular properties), GATS1i (2D autocorrelations),




Figure 3: The analysis of the fish toxicity dataset. The red lines in the left and right panels are the estimated curves via the single-index regression model (Wang et al., 2010) and model (1), respectively. The grey region represents the 95% confidence intervals of the estimates of the knot locations.

NdsCH (atom-type counts), and NdssC (atom-type counts). The raw data can be accessed at <https://michem.unimib.it>.

We investigate whether there exist effects of various variables on LC50. Several choices of X_i are tested, but none of them result in better R^2 values, compared to using GATS1i as Z_{i1} , NdsCH as Z_{i2} , NdssC as Z_{i3} , CIC0 as X_{i1} , SM1_Dz(Z) as X_{i2} , and MLOGP as X_{i3} . The R^2 is defined as in Section 6.1. To examine the presence of knots, the testing procedure described in Section 4 is performed, yielding a p-value of 0.0052, which indicates the presence of at least one knot. The parameters in model (1) are then estimated using the proposed method. Here, we also set $M_n = 5$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\delta_n = \{\log(M_n)/n\}^{0.8}$. The estimated results can be found in Table 7, and the number of estimated knots is $\widehat{M}_n = 2$. The left panel of

Figure 3 reports the estimated curve derived from the partial single-index regression model (Wang et al., 2010), while the right panel displays the fitted LSIR curve.

The right panel of Figure 3 shows the estimated knot locations at -2.38 and 4.73, both with p-values less than 0.05. Additionally, $\hat{\alpha}_0 = -0.14$ with p-value larger than 0.05, while both $\hat{\alpha}_1 = 0.67$ and $\hat{\alpha}_2 = -1.24$ with p-values less than 0.05. These findings indicate distinct effects of the index on LC50 in different intervals. Specifically, LC50 remains stable when the index falls within the interval $(-\infty, -2.38]$. LC50 increases at a rate of $\hat{\mu}_1 = \hat{\alpha}_0 + \hat{\alpha}_1 = 0.53$ when the index is in the interval $(-2.28, 4.73]$. Finally, LC50 decreases rapidly when the index is in the interval $(4.73, \infty)$.

7 Discussion

We proposed a linear spline index regression model for data analysis, where the locations and number of knots were unknown a priori. We developed a penalized smoothing least squares method to estimate the unknown parameters and demonstrated the consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed estimators. Moreover, we allowed the number of knots to diverge with the sample size. Simulation studies have indicated that the proposed method performs effectively.

To conclude this article, we will discuss several interesting topics for future study. First, the proposed method may be applicable to models with multiple indices and unknown knots. In addition, we can use a polynomial regression model to capture the nonlinear effects of an

index on each segment, defined as follows:

$$Y_i = \sum_{l=0}^{L_0} \alpha_{0l} (X_i^\top \beta)^l + \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \left[\sum_{l=0}^{L_m} \alpha_{ml} (X_i^\top \beta)^l \right] (X_i^\top \beta - \tau_m)_+ + Z_i^\top \gamma + \epsilon_i,$$

where L_m ($0 \leq m \leq M_n^*$) represents unspecified positive integers and α_{0l} ($1 \leq l \leq L_m$) are unknown parameters. Let L and M_n be some prespecified integers. Inspired by (3), we can estimate the unknown parameters by minimizing

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i - Z_i^\top \gamma - \sum_{l=0}^L \alpha_{0l} (X_i^\top \beta)^l - \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} \left[\sum_{l=0}^L \alpha_{ml} (X_i^\top \beta)^l \right] q_n(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_m) \right\}^2 + n \sum_{m=0}^{M_n} \|\tilde{\alpha}_m\|_1^{1/2},$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}_m = (\alpha_{m0}, \dots, \alpha_{mL})^\top$ and $\|\tilde{\alpha}_m\|_1 = \sum_{l=0}^L |\alpha_{ml}|$. Finally, the proposed method can be extended to encompass generalized linear models, quantile regression models and survival models. Investigating the applicability and performance of the method in these broader contexts would be an intriguing direction for future research.

Acknowledgments

Lianqiang Qu's research was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12471256). Meiling Hao's research was partially supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities in UIBE (CXTD14-05) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 12371264 and 12171329). Liuquan Sun's research was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12171463).

Supplementary material

Supplementary material includes the proofs of Theorems 1-4, an iterative procedure to minimize (4), and additional simulation results.

References

- Andrews, D. W. (2001). Testing when a parameter is on the boundary of the maintained hypothesis. *Econometrica*, **69**, 683–734.
- Card, D., Lee, D., Pei, Z., and Weber, A. (2012). Nonlinear policy rules and the identification and estimation of causal effects in a generalized regression kink design. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 18564.
- Carroll, R. J., Fan, J., Gijbels, I., and Wand, M. P. (1997). Generalized partially linear single-index models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **92**, 477–489.
- Cassotti, M., Ballabio, D., Todeschini, R., and Consonni, V. (2015). A similarity-based qsar model for predicting acute toxicity towards the fathead minnow (*pimephales promelas*). *SAR and QSAR in Environmental Research*, **26**, 217–243.
- Das, R., Banerjee, M., Nan, B., and Zheng, H. (2016). Fast estimation of regression parameters in a broken-stick model for longitudinal data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **111**, 1132–1143.

- Fan, A., Song, R., and Lu, W. (2017). Change-plane analysis for subgroup detection and sample size calculation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **112**, 769–778.
- Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **96**, 1348–1360.
- Fan, J. and Peng, H. (2004). Nonconcave penalized likelihood with a diverging number of parameters. *The Annals of Statistics*, **32**, 928–961.
- Glorot, X., Bordes, A., and Bengio, Y. (2011). Deep sparse rectifier neural networks. In *Proceedings of the fourteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 315–323. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings.
- Hansen, B. E. (2017). Regression kink with an unknown threshold. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, **35**, 228–240.
- Härdle, W., Hall, P., and Ichimura, H. (1993). Optimal smoothing in single-index models. *The Annals of Statistics*, **21**, 157–178.
- Hristache, M., Juditsky, A., and Spokoiny, V. (2001). Direct estimation of the index coefficient in a single-index model. *The Annals of Statistics*, **29**, 595–623.
- Ichimura, H. (1993). Semiparametric least squares (sls) and weighted sls estimation of single-index models. *Journal of Econometrics*, **58**, 71–120.
- Li, C., Wei, Y., Chappell, R., and He, X. (2011). Bent line quantile regression with application to an allometric study of land mammals’ speed and mass. *Biometrics*, **67**, 242–249.

- Ma, Y. and Zhu, L. (2013). Doubly robust and efficient estimators for heteroscedastic partially linear single-index models allowing high dimensional covariates. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, **75**, 305–322.
- Muggeo, V. M. (2003). Estimating regression models with unknown break-points. *Statistics in Medicine*, **22**, 3055–3071.
- Muggeo, V. M. and Adelfio, G. (2011). Efficient change point detection for genomic sequences of continuous measurements. *Bioinformatics*, **27**, 161–166.
- Powell, J. L., Stock, J. H., and Stoker, T. M. (1989). Semiparametric estimation of index coefficients. *Econometrica*, **57**, 1403–1430.
- Sun, Y., Wan, C., Zhang, W., and Zhong, W. (2024). A multi-kink quantile regression model with common structure for panel data analysis. *Journal of Econometrics*, **239**(2), 105304.
- Tishler, A. and Zang, I. (1981). A new maximum likelihood algorithm for piecewise regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **76**, 980–987.
- Wan, C., Zhong, W., Zhang, W., and Zou, C. (2023). Multikink quantile regression for longitudinal data with application to progesterone data analysis. *Biometrics*, **79**, 747–760.
- Wang, H., Li, B., and Leng, C. (2009). Shrinkage tuning parameter selection with a diverging number of parameters. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, **71**, 671–683.

- Wang, J.-L., Xue, L., Zhu, L., and Chong, Y. S. (2010). Estimation for a partial-linear single-index model. *The Annals of Statistics*, **38**, 246–274.
- Yang, G., Zhang, B., and Zhang, M. (2023). Estimation of knots in linear spline models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **118**, 639–650.
- Yeh, I.-C. and Hsu, T.-K. (2018). Building real estate valuation models with comparative approach through case-based reasoning. *Applied Soft Computing*, **65**, 260–271.
- Zhang, C.-H. (2010). Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty. *The Annals of Statistics*, **38**, 894–942.
- Zhang, Y., Zhou, Q., and Jiang, L. (2017). Panel kink regression with an unknown threshold. *Economics Letters*, **157**, 116–121.
- Zhong, W., Wan, C., and Zhang, W. (2022). Estimation and inference for multi-kink quantile regression. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, **40**, 1123–1139.

Table 1: Percentages (%) of correctly selecting $\widehat{M}_n = M_n^*$ for Cases 1-3.

Case	ν	n		$\mathcal{N}(0,1)$		$\text{Schi}^2(2)$		$t(4)$	
				$C_n = 1$	$\log \log n$	1	$\log \log n$	1	$\log \log n$
1	0.6	1000	SCAD	95.8	99.8	95.2	99.2	94.6	98.5
			MCP	95.3	99.9	94.6	99.3	93.7	98.9
		2000	SCAD	97.4	99.9	97.0	99.9	97.0	99.1
			MCP	96.8	99.9	96.7	99.8	96.4	99.4
	0.8	1000	SCAD	96.1	99.9	95.1	99.0	94.7	98.5
			MCP	95.6	99.9	94.9	99.3	93.9	99.1
		2000	SCAD	97.5	99.9	96.7	99.8	97.3	99.2
			MCP	97.1	99.9	96.8	99.8	96.3	99.3
2	0.6	1000	SCAD	96.4	99.7	95.6	99.0	94.5	98.1
			MCP	96.0	99.6	93.8	99.0	93.1	99.0
		2000	SCAD	97.5	100	96.7	99.9	95.9	99.4
			MCP	97.5	99.9	96.4	99.8	95.8	99.7
	0.8	1000	SCAD	96.5	99.7	95.1	99.0	94.1	98.1
			MCP	96.1	99.6	94.1	99.2	93.0	98.9
		2000	SCAD	97.2	99.9	96.6	99.9	95.9	99.4
			MCP	97.3	99.9	96.2	99.9	96.0	99.7
3	0.6	1000	SCAD	97.0	99.9	96.8	99.7	96.9	99.5
			MCP	97.0	99.9	96.9	99.7	96.9	99.5
		2000	SCAD	98.7	100	99.1	99.9	97.9	100
			MCP	98.7	100	99.1	99.9	97.9	100
	0.8	1000	SCAD	97.0	99.9	97.1	99.8	97.4	99.5
			MCP	97.1	99.9	97.1	99.8	97.4	99.5
		2000	SCAD	98.9	100	99.2	100	98.1	100
			MCP	98.9	100	99.2	100	98.0	100

Table 2: Simulation results (multiplied by 100) for Case 1 with $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

n	ν		Oracle				SCAD				MCP			
			Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP
1000	0.6	α_0	0.302	4.74	4.94	94.4	0.327	4.74	4.94	94.3	0.313	4.74	4.94	94.1
		α_1	-0.430	7.82	8.43	92.6	-0.487	7.82	8.42	92.6	-0.449	7.82	8.41	92.5
		τ_1	-0.244	5.61	5.90	93.5	-0.263	5.61	5.86	93.5	-0.242	5.61	5.85	93.6
		β_2	-0.381	4.13	4.31	93.4	-0.403	4.13	4.29	93.4	-0.393	4.13	4.28	93.5
		γ_1	0.026	3.35	3.39	94.7	0.028	3.35	3.37	95.0	0.026	3.35	3.37	95.1
	0.8	α_0	0.256	4.74	4.93	94.1	0.324	4.74	4.93	94.1	0.311	4.74	4.93	94.0
		α_1	-0.385	7.81	8.41	92.3	-0.504	7.81	8.41	92.2	-0.451	7.81	8.42	92.4
		τ_1	-0.279	5.59	5.88	93.4	-0.292	5.59	5.90	93.1	-0.249	5.59	5.88	93.4
		β_2	-0.334	4.12	4.29	93.7	-0.399	4.13	4.28	93.7	-0.391	4.12	4.28	93.6
		γ_1	0.033	3.34	3.39	94.7	0.027	3.34	3.37	95.0	0.027	3.34	3.38	95.0
2000	0.6	α_0	0.195	3.35	3.31	95.4	0.204	3.35	3.30	95.5	0.203	3.35	3.31	95.5
		α_1	-0.341	5.52	5.52	95.2	-0.362	5.52	5.52	95.1	-0.357	5.52	5.54	95.0
		τ_1	-0.093	3.95	4.06	94.4	-0.101	3.95	4.06	94.6	-0.097	3.95	4.06	94.5
		β_2	-0.311	2.91	2.90	94.8	-0.320	2.91	2.90	94.7	-0.321	2.91	2.90	94.8
		γ_1	0.017	2.37	2.31	95.6	0.014	2.37	2.30	95.7	0.014	2.37	2.30	95.6
	0.8	α_0	0.168	3.35	3.31	95.5	0.195	3.35	3.31	95.6	0.189	3.35	3.32	95.4
		α_1	-0.311	5.52	5.51	95.3	-0.361	5.52	5.54	95.1	-0.344	5.52	5.54	95.1
		τ_1	-0.108	3.94	4.07	94.3	-0.118	3.94	4.09	94.3	-0.109	3.94	4.08	94.3
		β_2	-0.282	2.90	2.90	94.9	-0.311	2.90	2.90	94.9	-0.306	2.90	2.91	94.9
		γ_1	0.021	2.37	2.31	95.7	0.016	2.37	2.30	95.8	0.016	2.37	2.30	95.7

Table 3: Simulation results (multiplied by 100) for Case 2 with $\nu = 0.6$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

n		Oracle				SCAD				MCP			
		Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP
1000	α_0	0.188	4.13	4.13	94.7	0.143	4.13	4.17	94.2	0.147	4.13	4.16	94.4
	α_1	-0.788	12.2	12.7	94.3	-0.604	12.2	12.9	94.6	-0.602	12.2	13.0	94.5
	α_2	1.275	13.6	14.2	94.0	1.074	13.6	14.2	93.9	1.134	13.6	14.2	93.9
	τ_1	-0.024	6.62	6.87	94.0	-0.136	6.63	6.96	93.6	-0.136	6.63	6.98	93.9
	τ_2	0.271	8.57	9.09	93.8	0.361	8.59	9.33	93.0	0.428	8.58	9.42	92.5
	β_2	0.050	3.26	3.36	93.6	0.008	3.27	3.40	93.3	0.008	3.27	3.40	93.2
	γ_1	-0.125	3.32	3.24	95.3	-0.132	3.32	3.25	95.1	-0.132	3.32	3.26	95.2
2000	α_0	-0.076	2.91	2.86	95.6	-0.076	2.91	2.84	95.9	-0.090	2.91	2.84	95.7
	α_1	-0.379	8.56	8.98	93.8	-0.380	8.56	8.96	93.9	-0.316	8.56	8.97	94.2
	α_2	0.644	9.56	9.97	94.1	0.627	9.56	9.94	94.3	0.580	9.56	9.95	94.1
	τ_1	0.036	4.66	4.84	94.3	0.036	4.66	4.79	94.4	0.003	4.67	4.82	94.3
	τ_2	0.223	6.03	6.36	93.0	0.221	6.03	6.40	92.9	0.261	6.03	6.41	92.9
	β_2	-0.086	2.30	2.41	93.5	-0.086	2.30	2.40	93.5	-0.098	2.30	2.40	93.3
	γ_1	-0.080	2.34	2.31	95.8	-0.079	2.34	2.31	95.7	-0.080	2.34	2.31	95.7

Table 4: Simulation results (multiplied by 100) for Case 3 with $\nu = 0.6$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

n		Oracle				SCAD				MCP			
		Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP
1000	α_0	0.076	3.05	3.21	93.7	0.021	3.05	3.20	94.1	0.022	3.05	3.20	94.1
	α_1	1.186	16.3	18.0	92.5	1.881	16.4	17.6	93.5	1.871	16.4	17.5	93.7
	α_2	-1.459	15.8	17.2	93.4	-1.783	15.9	17.0	93.5	-1.778	15.9	17.0	93.6
	α_3	-1.445	15.9	16.8	93.5	-0.628	15.8	17.0	93.0	-0.596	15.7	17.0	93.0
	α_4	1.818	18.4	19.2	93.8	0.845	18.3	19.5	93.3	0.833	18.3	19.5	93.3
	τ_1	-0.575	12.5	13.3	93.0	-0.212	12.5	13.2	93.4	-0.214	12.5	13.1	93.3
	τ_2	-0.465	11.3	12.1	92.9	-1.002	11.3	11.9	93.4	-1.006	11.3	11.9	93.4
	τ_3	1.091	11.3	12.2	92.3	-0.032	11.3	12.5	92.4	-0.047	11.3	12.5	92.4
	τ_4	0.553	13.6	14.3	93.5	0.848	13.6	14.5	93.4	0.865	13.6	14.4	93.3
	β_2	-0.269	5.08	5.37	93.9	-0.198	5.08	5.35	94.2	-0.198	5.08	5.35	94.2
γ_1	-0.217	3.46	3.56	95.0	-0.212	3.46	3.55	94.9	-0.212	3.46	3.55	94.9	
2000	α_0	0.026	2.16	2.19	94.1	-0.020	2.16	2.17	94.6	-0.020	2.16	2.17	94.6
	α_1	-0.054	11.4	11.9	93.2	0.443	11.5	11.8	93.9	0.477	11.5	11.7	93.8
	α_2	-0.055	11.1	11.4	94.2	-0.321	11.1	11.3	94.0	-0.353	11.1	11.3	94.0
	α_3	-0.660	11.1	11.6	94.0	-0.189	11.1	11.6	93.1	-0.206	11.1	11.6	93.3
	α_4	0.881	12.9	13.6	94.3	0.319	12.8	13.7	93.7	0.337	12.8	13.7	93.7
	τ_1	-0.482	8.85	9.05	93.2	-0.209	8.85	8.94	93.7	-0.199	8.84	8.94	93.7
	τ_2	0.167	7.96	8.32	93.4	-0.165	7.96	8.19	93.7	-0.193	7.96	8.18	94.0
	τ_3	0.253	7.96	8.50	93.3	-0.408	7.95	8.57	93.0	-0.399	7.95	8.56	93.0
	τ_4	0.193	9.58	10.1	93.5	0.318	9.59	10.0	93.3	0.314	9.59	10.0	93.4
	β_2	-0.167	3.59	3.65	94.8	-0.103	3.59	3.61	95.4	-0.102	3.59	3.61	95.4
γ_1	-0.033	2.45	2.47	93.5	-0.032	2.45	2.46	93.5	-0.032	2.45	2.46	93.5	

Table 5: Empirical sizes (%) and powers (%) of the proposed test at 0.05 level of significance.

Case	ϵ_i	ν	$n = 500$						$n = 1000$					
			$\tilde{\alpha} = 0$	0.05	0.1	0.15	0.2	0.25	$\tilde{\alpha} = 0$	0.05	0.1	0.15	0.2	0.25
4	$\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$	0.6	4.50	14.5	41.8	77.1	94.2	99.6	5.20	23.5	74.0	98.3	100	100
		0.7	4.20	14.4	41.8	77.1	94.1	99.5	4.70	23.0	74.5	98.3	100	100
		0.8	4.60	14.1	42.1	77.0	94.3	99.6	4.80	22.7	73.9	98.3	100	100
	Schi ² (2)	0.6	4.70	10.6	37.6	75.9	96.3	99.9	5.50	17.0	72.2	98.1	100	100
		0.7	4.70	10.6	36.6	75.1	96.3	99.9	5.60	16.8	72.6	98.0	100	100
		0.8	4.60	10.5	37.3	75.8	96.4	99.9	5.90	16.5	72.7	97.9	100	100
	$t(4)$	0.6	5.00	10.6	24.0	45.9	73.1	88.6	5.00	13.7	40.9	79.8	95.5	99.3
		0.7	5.20	10.3	24.2	46.5	73.3	89.0	5.00	13.2	40.7	79.5	95.4	99.3
		0.8	4.90	10.4	23.7	45.9	73.4	88.7	4.80	13.8	41.1	79.7	95.5	99.2
5	$\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$	0.6	4.40	45.1	97.1	100	100	100	4.70	74.3	100	100	100	100
		0.7	4.60	44.8	97.3	100	100	100	5.00	74.6	100	100	100	100
		0.8	4.60	44.8	97.0	100	100	100	4.60	74.0	100	100	100	100
	Schi ² (2)	0.6	5.20	42.4	99.2	100	100	100	4.90	76.4	100	100	100	100
		0.7	5.40	41.8	99.3	100	100	100	4.70	75.8	100	100	100	100
		0.8	5.80	42.0	99.2	100	100	100	4.90	75.8	100	100	100	100
	$t(4)$	0.6	5.30	27.5	75.6	97.8	99.9	100	4.40	46.9	96.8	100	100	100
		0.7	4.80	27.9	75.2	98.0	99.9	100	4.60	46.9	96.8	100	100	100
		0.8	5.30	27.4	75.3	97.7	99.9	100	4.40	47.2	97.2	100	100	100

Table 6: Analysis results for real estate valuation dataset.

	SCAD				MCP			
	Est	SE	CI	p-value	Est	SE	CI	p-value
α_0	2.99	0.77	(1.47,4.50)	0.000	2.99	0.77	(1.47,4.50)	0.000
α_1	16.7	2.19	(12.4,21.0)	0.000	16.7	2.19	(12.4,21.0)	0.000
τ_1	-0.25	0.11	(-0.47,-0.03)	0.025	-0.25	0.11	(-0.47,-0.03)	0.025
β_2	-0.15	0.03	(-0.21,-0.10)	0.000	-0.15	0.03	(-0.21,-0.10)	0.000
β_3	0.11	0.03	(0.06,0.16)	0.000	0.11	0.03	(0.06,0.16)	0.000
γ_0	26.8	1.38	(24.1,29.5)	0.000	26.8	1.38	(24.1,29.5)	0.000
γ_1	0.52	0.20	(0.13,0.90)	0.009	0.52	0.20	(0.13,0.90)	0.009

Table 7: Analysis results for fish toxicity dataset.

	SCAD				MCP			
	Est	SE	CI	p-value	Est	SE	CI	p-value
α_0	-0.14	0.11	(-0.37,0.08)	0.212	-0.14	0.11	(-0.37,0.08)	0.212
α_1	0.67	0.13	(0.42,0.92)	0.000	0.67	0.13	(0.42,0.92)	0.000
α_2	-1.24	0.25	(-1.73,-0.74)	0.000	-1.24	0.25	(-1.73,-0.74)	0.000
τ_1	-2.38	0.32	(-3.02,-1.75)	0.000	-2.38	0.32	(-3.02,-1.75)	0.000
τ_2	4.73	0.42	(3.91,5.54)	0.000	4.73	0.42	(3.91,5.54)	0.000
β_2	1.23	0.09	(1.05,1.42)	0.000	1.23	0.09	(1.05,1.42)	0.000
β_3	1.11	0.16	(0.80,1.43)	0.000	1.11	0.16	(0.80,1.43)	0.000
γ_0	2.31	0.40	(1.52,3.10)	0.000	2.31	0.40	(1.52,3.10)	0.000
γ_1	-0.38	0.04	(-0.45,-0.31)	0.000	-0.38	0.04	(-0.45,-0.31)	0.000
γ_2	0.37	0.05	(0.27,0.47)	0.000	0.37	0.05	(0.27,0.47)	0.000
γ_3	0.03	0.04	(-0.05,0.11)	0.444	0.03	0.04	(-0.05,0.11)	0.444

Supplementary Material to “Linear spline index regression model: Interpretability, nonlinearity and dimension reduction”

This supplementary material is organized as follows. Section A provides the proofs of Theorems 1-4. Section B presents several lemmas. Section C introduces an iterative algorithm to minimize (4). Section D presents additional results from the simulation studies.

A Proofs of Theorems 1-4

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Define $\rho_n = \sqrt{s_n}(1/\sqrt{n} + a_n)$ and

$$L_n(\theta) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta - \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta - \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} \alpha_m q_n(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_m) \right\}^2}_{h_n(\theta)} + n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} p_{\lambda_n, t}(|\alpha_m|).$$

The proofs are divided in the following steps.

Step 1. We constrain $L_n(\theta)$ to the s_n -dimensional subspace $\mathcal{B} = \{\theta : \alpha_m = 0, m = M_n^* + 1, \dots, M_n\}$. Let

$$\bar{L}_n(\theta_o) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta - \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta - \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m q_n(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_m) \right\}^2}_{\bar{h}_n(\theta_o)} + n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} p_{\lambda_n, t}(|\alpha_m|).$$

We show that there exists a strict local minimizer $\hat{\theta}_1$ of $\bar{L}_n(\theta_o)$ such that $\|\hat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\| = O_p(\rho_n)$.

It suffices to show that for any given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a sufficiently large constant C_0 such

that

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\inf_{\|u\|=C_0} \bar{L}_n(\theta_o^* + \rho_n u) > \bar{L}_n(\theta_o^*)\right\} \geq 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Define $\mathcal{O}_n(u) = \bar{L}_n(\theta_o^* + \rho_n u) - \bar{L}_n(\theta_o^*)$. By the Taylor expansion of $\mathcal{O}_n(u)$ at θ_o^* , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_n(u) &= \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^* + \rho_n u) - \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*) + n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \{p_{\lambda_n, t}(|\alpha_m^* + \rho_n u_m|) - p_{\lambda_n, t}(|\alpha_m^*|)\} \\ &= \underbrace{\rho_n \left\{ \frac{\partial \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_o} \right\}^\top}_{I_1} u + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} u^\top \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_o \partial \theta_o^\top} u \rho_n^2}_{I_2} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{6} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_o} \left(u^\top \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}_n(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_o \partial \theta_o^\top} u \right) \right\}^\top}_{I_3} u \rho_n^3 \\ &\quad + \underbrace{n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \rho_n p'_{\lambda_n, t}(|\alpha_m^*|) \text{sgn}(\alpha_m^*) u_m}_{I_4} + \underbrace{n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \frac{1}{2} \rho_n^2 p''_{\lambda_n, t}(|\alpha_m^*|) u_m^2 \{1 + o(1)\}}_{I_5}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\check{\theta}_o$ lies between θ_o^* and $\theta_o^* + \rho_n u$ and u_m is the m th element of u . To prove (A.1), we need to demonstrate that the right-hand side of (A.2) is positive for a sufficiently large value of C_0 . For simplicity, let $d = d_1 + d_2 + 1$, and define

$$\begin{aligned} T_{ni}(\theta_o) &= Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta - \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta - \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m q_n(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_m), \\ \text{and } T_i(\theta_o) &= Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta - \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta - \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m f(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_m). \end{aligned}$$

Then, let $g_{ni}(\theta_o) = \partial \bar{h}_n(\theta_o) / \partial \theta_o$ and $g_{ni, j}(\theta_o)$ be the j th element of $g_{ni}(\theta_o)$, where

$$g_{ni, j}(\theta_o) = \begin{cases} -q_n(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_j) T_{ni}(\theta_o), & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq M_n^*, \\ -\alpha_{j-M_n^*} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_{j-M_n^*}} q_n(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_{j-M_n^*}) T_{ni}(\theta_o), & \text{if } M_n^* + 1 \leq j \leq 2M_n^*, \\ -X_i^\top \beta T_{ni}(\theta_o), & \text{if } j = 2M_n^* + 1, \\ -(\alpha_0 X_{i, j-2M_n^*} + \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m \frac{\partial q_n(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_m)}{\partial \beta_{j-2M_n^*}}) T_{ni}(\theta_o), & \text{if } 2M_n^* + 2 \leq j \leq 2M_n^* + d_1, \\ -\tilde{Z}_{i, j-2M_n^*-d_1-1} T_{ni}(\theta_o), & \text{if } 2M_n^* + d_1 + 1 \leq j \leq 2M_n^* + d. \end{cases}$$

Additionally, we define $g_i(\theta_o) = (g_{i,1}(\theta_o), \dots, g_{i,s_n^*}(\theta_o))^\top$, where

$$g_{i,j}(\theta_o) = \begin{cases} -f(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_j) T_i(\theta_o), & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq M_n^*, \\ \alpha_{j-M_n^*} I(X_i^\top \beta > \tau_{j-M_n^*}) T_i(\theta_o), & \text{if } M_n^* + 1 \leq j \leq 2M_n^*, \\ -X_i^\top \beta T_i(\theta_o), & \text{if } j = 2M_n^* + 1, \\ -X_{i,j-2M_n^*} (\alpha_0 + \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m I(X_i^\top \beta > \tau_m)) T_i(\theta_o), & \text{if } 2M_n^* + 2 \leq j \leq 2M_n^* + d_1, \\ -\tilde{Z}_{i,j-2M_n^*-d_1-1} T_i(\theta_o), & \text{if } 2M_n^* + d_1 + 1 \leq j \leq 2M_n^* + d. \end{cases}$$

We begin by demonstrating

$$|I_1| = O_p(n\rho_n^2 \|u\|). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

For this purpose, we can express the summation as follows:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n g_{ni}(\theta_o^*) = \sum_{i=1}^n \{g_{ni}(\theta_o^*) - g_i(\theta_o^*)\} + \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta_o^*).$$

For each $1 \leq j \leq M_n^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\{|g_{ni,j}(\theta_o^*) - g_{i,j}(\theta_o^*)|\} \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}\left\{ |(Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^*) (q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_j^*) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_j^*))| \right\} \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}\left\{ \left| \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* \left(q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_j) q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_j) f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) \right) \right| \right\}. \quad (\text{A.4}) \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity of presence, we assume that the support of $\mathcal{K}(x)$ is $[-1, 1]$. According to condition 5, we obtain

$$|q_n(w, \tau_m^*) - f(w, \tau_m^*)| \leq C_1 \delta_n I(\tau_m^* - \delta_n \leq w \leq \tau_m^* + \delta_n), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\{I(\tau_m^* - \delta_n \leq W_i \leq \tau_m^* + \delta_n)\} = \int_{\tau_m^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_m^* + \delta_n} dF(w) = O(\delta_n), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $W_i = X_i^\top \beta^*$, $F(w)$ represents the cumulative distribution function of W_i and C_1 is a positive constant. By (A.5), (A.6) and conditions 1-4, we have that the first term on the right hand side of (A.4) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left\{\left|(Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^*)(q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_j^*) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_j^*))\right|\right\} \\ & \leq C_1 \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} |\alpha_m^*| \times |\tau_j^* - \tau_m^*| \delta_n \mathbb{E}\{I(\tau_j^* - \delta_n \leq X_i^\top \beta^* \leq \tau_j^* + \delta_n)\} \\ & \quad + C_1 |\alpha_j^*| \mathbb{E}\{f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_j^*) \delta_n I(\tau_j^* - \delta_n \leq X_i^\top \beta^* \leq \tau_j^* + \delta_n)\} \\ & \quad + C_1 \mathbb{E}\{\delta_n I(\tau_j^* - \delta_n \leq X_i^\top \beta^* \leq \tau_j^* + \delta_n) \mathbb{E}(|\epsilon_i| | X_i^\top \beta^*)\} \\ & \leq O(M_n \delta_n^2) + O(\delta_n^2), \end{aligned}$$

and the second term on the right hand side of (A.4) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left\{\left|\sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* \left(q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_j) q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_j) f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m)\right)\right|\right\} \\ & \leq C_1 \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} |\alpha_m^*| \times |\tau_j^* - \tau_m^*| \delta_n \mathbb{E}\{I(\tau_j^* - \delta_n \leq X_i^\top \beta^* \leq \tau_j^* + \delta_n)\} \\ & \quad + C_1^2 |\alpha_j^*| \delta_n^2 \mathbb{E}\{I(\tau_j^* - \delta_n \leq X_i^\top \beta^* \leq \tau_j^* + \delta_n)\} \\ & \quad + C_1 \sum_{m=j+1}^{M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*| \times |\tau_m^* - \tau_j^*| \delta_n \mathbb{E}\{I(\tau_m^* - \delta_n \leq X_i^\top \beta^* \leq \tau_m^* + \delta_n)\} \\ & \leq O(M_n \delta_n^2) + O(\delta_n^3) + O(M_n \delta_n^2). \end{aligned}$$

These facts, together with (A.4), imply

$$\mathbb{E}\{|g_{ni,j}(\theta_o^*) - g_{i,j}(\theta_o^*)|\} \leq O(M_n \delta_n^2) + O(\delta_n^2) = O(M_n^2 \delta_n), \quad j = 1, \dots, M_n^*. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Furthermore, for each $M_n^* + 1 \leq j \leq s_n^*$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{|g_{ni,j}(\theta_o^*) - g_{i,j}(\theta_o^*)|\} \leq O(M_n^2 \delta_n). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

The proof of (A.8) is provided in Section B.

By Markov's inequality, it follows from (A.7) and (A.8) that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \{g_{ni,j}(\theta_o^*) - g_{i,j}(\theta_o^*)\} = O_p(\sqrt{n} M_n^2 \delta_n).$$

Thus, if $\sqrt{n} M_n^2 \delta_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \{g_{ni}(\theta_o^*) - g_i(\theta_o^*)\} \right\| \leq O_p(\sqrt{n s_n} M_n^2 \delta_n) = o_p(\sqrt{s_n}). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Furthermore, for each $1 \leq j \leq s_n^*$, by utilizing the central limit theorem, we can demonstrate

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g_{i,j}(\theta_o^*) = O_p(1).$$

This implies

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta_o^*) \right\| \leq O_p(\sqrt{s_n}). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Combining (A.9) and (A.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{\partial \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_o} \right\| &= \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g_{ni}(\theta_o^*) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta_o^*) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta_o^*) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g_{ni}(\theta_o^*) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta_o^*) \right\| + \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta_o^*) \right\| \\ &= o_p(\sqrt{s_n}) + O_p(\sqrt{s_n}) = O_p(\sqrt{s_n}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Then, we can get

$$|I_1| = \rho_n \left| \left\{ \frac{\partial \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_o} \right\}^\top u \right| \leq \rho_n \left\| \frac{\partial \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_o} \right\| \|u\| = O_p(\sqrt{n s_n} \rho_n) \|u\| = O_p(n \rho_n^2) \|u\|,$$

and hence (A.3) holds.

Next, we show

$$I_2 \geq O_p(n\rho_n^2\|u\|^2/2). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Since for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^{s_n^*}$, $a^\top V(\theta_o^*)a = a^\top \mathbb{E}\{H_i(\theta_o^*)H_i(\theta_o^*)^\top\}a > 0$, there exists a positive constant \tilde{c} such that $\text{eig}_{\min}(V(\theta_o^*)) > \tilde{c}$, where $\text{eig}_{\min}(A)$ denotes the minimum eigenvalues of matrix A . By Lemma 1 in Section B, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \frac{n\rho_n^2}{2} u^\top \left[\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_o \partial \theta_o^\top} - V(\theta_o^*) \right] u + \frac{n\rho_n^2}{2} u^\top V(\theta_o^*) u \\ &= \frac{n\rho_n^2}{2} u^\top V(\theta_o^*) u + o_p(1)n\rho_n^2\|u\|^2 \\ &\geq \tilde{c}n\rho_n^2\|u\|^2/2 + o_p(n\rho_n^2\|u\|^2), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that (A.12) holds.

For I_3 , we begin with the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{6} \sum_{j,k,l=1}^{s_n^*} \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \frac{\partial^3 \bar{h}_n(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok} \partial \theta_{ol}} - \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial^3 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok} \partial \theta_{ol}} \right\} u_j u_k u_l n \rho_n^3}_{I_{31}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{6n} \sum_{j,k,l=1}^{s_n^*} \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial^3 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok} \partial \theta_{ol}} u_j u_k u_l n \rho_n^3}_{I_{32}}. \end{aligned}$$

By (A.5) and (A.6), along with conditions 1-4, we can show that for any θ_o satisfying

$$\|\theta_o - \theta_o^*\| \leq \rho_n \|u\|,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^3 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok} \partial \theta_{ol}} \right) &= \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^3 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok} \partial \theta_{ol}} \right) + o(1), \\ \text{VAR} \left(\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^3 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok} \partial \theta_{ol}} \right) &\leq O \left(\frac{M_n^3}{n\delta_n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $s_n^3/(n\delta_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then according to Chebyshev's inequality, we can obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \left\{ \frac{\partial^3 \bar{h}_n(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok} \partial \theta_{ol}} - \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial^3 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok} \partial \theta_{ol}} \right\} = o_p(1), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

which implies that $|I_{31}| \leq o_p(s_n^{3/2} n \rho_n^3 \|u\|^3)$.

For I_{32} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{32}| &\leq \frac{1}{6} \left[\sum_{j,k,l=1}^{s_n} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial^3 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok} \partial \theta_{ol}} \right\}^2 \right]^{1/2} \|u\|^3 n \rho_n^3 \\ &\leq O(n s_n^{3/2} M_n^2 \rho_n^3 \|u\|^3), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds due to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and the second inequality holds because $n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \{ \partial^3 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*) / \partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok} \partial \theta_{ol} \} < O(M_n^2)$. Thus, $|I_{32}| = o(n \rho_n^2 \|u\|^2)$ if $s_n^4/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$ and $s_n^4 a_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. These facts implies

$$|I_3| = o_p(n \rho_n^2 \|u\|^2). \quad (\text{A.14})$$

By the definition of a_n , we can show

$$|I_4| = \left| \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} n \rho_n p'_{\lambda_n, t}(|\alpha_m^*|) \text{sgn}(\alpha_m^*) u_m \right| \leq \sqrt{M_n^*} n \rho_n a_n \|u\| \leq n \rho_n^2 \|u\|. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

For I_5 , since $b_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$|I_5| = \left| \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} n \rho_n^2 p''_{\lambda_n, t}(|\alpha_m^*|) u_m^2 \{1 + o(1)\} \right| \leq o(n \rho_n^2 \|u\|^2). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Combining (A.3), (A.12), and (A.14)-(A.16), we obtain that I_1, I_3, I_4 and I_5 are dominated by I_2 for some sufficiently large C_0 . Thus, the sign of $\mathcal{O}_n(u)$ is determined by that of I_2 , which is positive. This proves that (A.1) holds, and therefore $\|\hat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\| = O_p(\rho_n)$.

Note that when $\alpha_m = 0$ ($m = M_n^* + 1, \dots, M_n$), $L_n(\theta)$ is free of $\tilde{\tau} = (\tau_{M_n^*+1}, \dots, \tau_{M_n})^\top$ and $\bar{L}_n(\theta_o) = L_n(\theta)$. Hence, for any $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{M_n - M_n^*}$, $\hat{\theta}(\tilde{\tau}) = (\hat{\theta}_1^\top, \tilde{\tau}^\top, \mathbf{0}_{M_n - M_n^*}^\top)^\top$ is also a local minimizer of $L_n(\theta)$ in the subspace \mathcal{B} , and satisfies that $\|\hat{\theta}(\tilde{\tau}) - \theta^*(\tilde{\tau})\| = O_p(\rho_n)$, where $\theta^*(\tilde{\tau}) = ((\theta_o^*)^\top, \tilde{\tau}^\top, \mathbf{0}_{M_n - M_n^*}^\top)^\top$.

Step 2. We show that with probability tending to 1, the local minimizer $\hat{\theta}(\tilde{\tau})$ defined in Step 1 is also the local minimizer of $L_n(\theta)$ for any $\tilde{\tau}$. For this purpose, let $\mathbb{N}_C = \{\theta : \|\theta - \hat{\theta}(\tilde{\tau})\| \leq C_2 \rho_n\} \cap \mathcal{B}$, and $\mathbb{N}_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{s_n}$ be a sufficiently small ball around $\hat{\theta}(\tilde{\tau})$, satisfying that for any $\theta \in \mathbb{N}_1$, $\|\theta - \hat{\theta}(\tilde{\tau})\| = O(\rho_n)$ and $\mathbb{N}_1 \cap \mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{N}_C$. For simplicity, write $\hat{\theta} = \hat{\theta}(\tilde{\tau})$ and $\theta^* = \theta^*(\tilde{\tau})$.

It suffices to show that for any $w_1 \in \mathbb{N}_1 - \mathbb{N}_C$, $L_n(w_1) > L_n(\hat{\theta})$. We begin with the following decomposition

$$L_n(w_1) - L_n(\hat{\theta}) = L_n(w_1) - L_n(w_2) + L_n(w_2) - L_n(\hat{\theta}),$$

where w_2 is the projection of w_1 on subspace \mathcal{B} . By the definition of $\hat{\theta}$, we have that $\hat{\theta}$ is a local minimizer of $L_n(\theta)$ constrained on subspace \mathcal{B} , and hence $L_n(w_2) > L_n(\hat{\theta})$ if $w_2 \neq \hat{\theta}$. Thus, we need to show that $L_n(w_1) - L_n(w_2) > 0$.

Note that $w_{1j} = w_{2j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq \tilde{s}_n$, where $\tilde{s}_n = 1 + d_1 + d_2 + M_n + M_n^*$, and w_{kj} is the j th element of w_k for $k = 1, 2$. Therefore, by the mean-value theorem, we have

$$L_n(w_1) - L_n(w_2) = \sum_{j=\tilde{s}_n+1}^{s_n} \frac{\partial L_n(w_0)}{\partial w_j} w_{1j},$$

where w_0 lies on the line segment joining w_1 and w_2 . We show that the term on the right hand side of the above equation is positive. It suffices to show that for each $j = \tilde{s}_n + 1, \dots, s_n$,

with probability tending to 1, it holds

$$\frac{\partial L_n(w)}{\partial w_j} < 0 \quad \text{for } -\varepsilon_n < w_j < 0, \quad (\text{A.17})$$

$$\text{and } \frac{\partial L_n(w)}{\partial w_j} > 0 \quad \text{for } 0 < w_j < \varepsilon_n, \quad (\text{A.18})$$

where $\varepsilon_n = C_3\sqrt{s_n/n}$, and C_3 denotes a positive constant. Here w is a vector satisfying $\|w - \theta^*\| \leq O(\sqrt{s_n/n})$, and w_j is the j th element of w .

We first show (A.18). By the Taylor expansion of $\partial L_n(w)/\partial w_j$ at θ^* , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L_n(w)}{\partial w_j} &= \underbrace{\frac{\partial h_n(\theta^*)}{\partial w_j}}_{I_{6j}} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^{s_n} \frac{\partial^2 h_n(\theta^*)}{\partial w_j \partial w_k} (w_k - \theta_k^*)}_{I_{7j}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{k,l=1}^{s_n} \frac{\partial^3 h_n(\check{\theta})}{\partial w_j \partial w_k \partial w_l} (w_k - \theta_k^*)(w_l - \theta_l^*) + np'_{\lambda_n,t}(|w_j|)\text{sgn}(w_j)}_{I_{8j}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

where $\check{\theta}$ lies between w and θ^* .

For each $j = \tilde{s}_n + 1, \dots, s_n$, using the arguments similar to the proof of (A.11) and considering the fact that $\sqrt{n}M_n^2\delta_n/s_n \rightarrow 0$, we can conclude

$$I_{6j} = o_p(\sqrt{n}s_n). \quad (\text{A.20})$$

For I_{7j} , using the arguments similar to the proof of Lemma 1 in Section B, we can show

$$\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 h_n(\theta^*)}{\partial w_j \partial w_k} - \tilde{V}_{j,k}(\theta^*) = o_p(1), \quad k = 1, \dots, s_n, \quad (\text{A.21})$$

where $\tilde{V}_{j,k}(\theta^*)$ denotes the (j, k) th element of $\tilde{V}(\theta^*) = \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{H}_i(\theta^*)\tilde{H}_i(\theta^*)^\top\}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_i(\theta^*) &= \left(f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_1^*), \dots, f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_{M_n}^*), -\alpha_1^* I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_1^*), \dots, -\alpha_{M_n}^* I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_{M_n}^*), \right. \\ &\quad \left. X_i^\top \beta^*, \left[\alpha_0^* + \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} \alpha_m^* I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_m^*) \right] \tilde{X}_i^\top, \tilde{Z}_i^\top \right)^\top. \end{aligned}$$

By (A.21) and the fact that $\|w - \theta^*\| \leq O(\sqrt{s_n/n})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{7j} &= \sum_{k=1}^{s_n} \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 h_n(\theta^*)}{\partial w_j \partial w_k} - n\tilde{V}_{j,k}(\theta^*) \right\} (w_k - \theta_k^*) + \sum_{k=1}^{s_n} n\tilde{V}_{j,k}(\theta^*) (w_k - \theta_k^*) \\
&\leq \left[\sum_{k=1}^{s_n} \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 h_n(\theta^*)}{\partial w_j \partial w_k} - n\tilde{V}_{j,k}(\theta^*) \right\}^2 \right]^{1/2} \|w - \theta^*\| + n \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{s_n} \tilde{V}_{j,k}^2(\theta^*) \right\}^{1/2} \|w - \theta^*\| \\
&= o_p(\sqrt{n}s_n) + O(\sqrt{n}s_n) = O_p(\sqrt{n}s_n),
\end{aligned} \tag{A.22}$$

where the inequality holds due to the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. Similarly, we can show

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{8j} &= \sum_{k,l=1}^{s_n} \left\{ \frac{\partial^3 h_n(\check{\theta})}{\partial w_j \partial w_k \partial w_l} - \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial^3 h_n(\theta^*)}{\partial w_j \partial w_k \partial w_l} \right) \right\} (w_k - \theta_k^*) (w_l - \theta_l^*) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k,l=1}^{s_n} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial^3 h_n(\theta^*)}{\partial w_j \partial w_k \partial w_l} \right) (w_k - \theta_k^*) (w_l - \theta_l^*) \\
&\leq o_p(ns_n) \|w - \theta^*\|^2 + O(ns_n M_n^2) \|w - \theta^*\|^2 \\
&= o_p(s_n^2) + O(s_n^2 M_n^2) = o_p(\sqrt{n}s_n).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.23}$$

Combining (A.19)-(A.23), we obtain

$$\frac{\partial L_n(w)}{\partial w_j} = n\sqrt{s_n}\lambda_n \left\{ \lambda_n^{-1} p'_{\lambda_n,t}(|w_j|) \text{sgn}(w_j) + O_p(\sqrt{s_n/(n\lambda_n^2)}) \right\}.$$

Since $\sqrt{s_n/(n\lambda_n^2)} \rightarrow 0$ and $\lambda_n^{-1} p'_{\lambda_n,t}(0^+) > 0$, we have that for all sufficiently large n ,

$$\frac{\partial L_n(w)}{\partial w_j} > n\sqrt{s_n} p'_{\lambda_n,t}(|w_j|) \text{sgn}(w_j) / 2,$$

which implies that the sign of $\partial L_n(w)/\partial w_j$ is determined by that of w_j . Hence, we have that (A.18) holds. Similarly, we can show that (A.17) holds. Note that $w_1 \in \mathbb{N}_1 - \mathbb{N}_C$ and $\mathbb{N}_1 \cap \mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{N}_C$. Thus, there exists at least one $\tilde{s}_n + 1 \leq j \leq s_n$ such that $w_{1j} \neq 0$, and the sign of w_{0j} is the same as that of w_{1j} . These facts imply

$$L_n(w_1) - L_n(w_2) = \sum_{j=\tilde{s}_n+1}^{s_n} \frac{\partial L_n(w_0)}{\partial w_j} w_{1j} > n\sqrt{s_n} p'_{\lambda_n,t}(|w_{0j}|) |w_{1j}| / 2 \geq 0$$

for all sufficient large n and all $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{M_n - M_n^*}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

By Theorem 1, we know that there exists a local minimizer $\hat{\theta}$ of $L_n(\theta)$ such that $\hat{\theta}$ is $(n/s_n)^{1/2}$ -consistent. To prove Theorem 2, we first show

$$\{V(\theta_o^*) + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\theta_o^*)\}(\hat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*) + B(\theta_o^*) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta_o^*) + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{A.24})$$

By the Taylor expansion of $\partial \bar{L}_n(\hat{\theta}_1)/\partial \theta_o$ at θ_o^* , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \left[\left\{ \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_o \partial \theta_o^\top} + n \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\check{\theta}_o) \right\} (\hat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*) + n B(\theta_o^*) \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_o} - \frac{1}{2n} (\hat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*)^\top \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_o \partial \theta_o^\top} \left(\frac{\partial \bar{h}_n(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_o} \right) (\hat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

where $\check{\theta}_o$ lies between $\hat{\theta}_1$ and θ_o^* . For simplicity of presentation, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_1 &= \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_o \partial \theta_o^\top} + n \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\check{\theta}_o), \\ \text{and } \Upsilon_2 &= \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*)^\top \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_o \partial \theta_o^\top} \left(\frac{\partial \bar{h}_n(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_o} \right) (\hat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1 and condition 6, we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \Upsilon_1 - \{V(\theta_o^*) + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\theta_o^*)\} \right\|_{\text{F}} = o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_n}}\right).$$

This, together with $\|\hat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\| = O_p(\sqrt{s_n/n})$, implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \Upsilon_1 - V(\theta_o^*) - \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\theta_o^*) \right\} (\hat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*) \right\| \\ & \leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} \Upsilon_1 - V(\theta_o^*) - \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\theta_o^*) \right\|_{\text{F}} \times \|\hat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\| = o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.26})$$

By applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to Υ_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{1}{n} \Upsilon_2 \right\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\widehat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\|^4 \sum_{j,k,l=1}^{s_n^*} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial \bar{h}_n(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok} \partial \theta_{ol}} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial \bar{h}_n(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok} \partial \theta_{ol}} \right\}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \|\widehat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\|^4 \sum_{j,k,l=1}^{s_n^*} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial \bar{h}_n(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok} \partial \theta_{ol}} \right\}^2 \\
&= O_p\left(\frac{s_n^2}{n^2}\right) o_p(s_n^3) + O_p\left(\frac{s_n^2}{n^2}\right) O(s_n^3 M_n^4) = o_p\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.27}$$

In addition, it follows the proof of I_1 in Theorem 1 that

$$\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_o} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta_o^*) + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \tag{A.28}$$

Combining (A.25)–(A.28), we have that (A.24) holds.

For simplicity, we write $\Sigma_{\lambda_n}^* = \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\theta_o^*)$, $B^* = B(\theta_o^*)$ and $V_* = V(\theta_o^*)$. By (A.24), we consider the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{n} A_n V_*^{-1/2} \{V_* + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}^*\} \left[(\widehat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*) + \{V_* + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}^*\}^{-1} B^* \right] \\
&= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} A_n V_*^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta_o^*) + o_p\left(A_n V_*^{-1/2}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.29}$$

By the conditions in Theorem 2, it can be directly shown that the last term is $o_p(1)$.

Define

$$\mathcal{Y}_{ni} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} A_n V_*^{-1/2} g_i(\theta_o^*).$$

Next, we show that \mathcal{Y}_{ni} satisfies the Lindeberg–Feller conditions. It follows that for any

$\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \|\mathcal{Y}_{ni}\|^2 I(\|\mathcal{Y}_{ni}\| > \varepsilon) \leq n \{\mathbb{E} \|\mathcal{Y}_{ni}\|^4\}^{1/2} \{\mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{Y}_{ni}\| > \varepsilon)\}^{1/2}. \tag{A.30}$$

By the conditions in Theorem 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{Y}_{n1}\|^4 &= \frac{1}{n^2}\mathbb{E}\|A_n V_*^{-1/2}g_1(\theta_o^*)\|^4 \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2}\mathbb{E}\|(g_1(\theta_o^*))^\top (V_*^{-1/2})^\top A_n^\top A_n V_*^{-1/2}g_1(\theta_o^*)\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n^2}\text{eig}_{\max}(A_n^\top A_n)\text{eig}_{\max}(V_*^{-1})\mathbb{E}\|(g_1(\theta_o^*))^\top g_1(\theta_o^*)\|^2 \\
&= O\left(\frac{s_n^2}{n^2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{Y}_{n1}\| > \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\|A_n V_*^{-1/2}g_1(\theta_o^*)\|^2}{n\varepsilon^2} = O\left(\frac{s_n}{n}\right).$$

Thus, by (A.30) and the condition $s_n^3/n \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\|\mathcal{Y}_{ni}\|^2 I(\|\mathcal{Y}_{ni}\| > \varepsilon) = O\left(n \frac{s_n}{n} \sqrt{\frac{s_n}{n}}\right) = o(1).$$

On the other hand, since $A_n A_n^\top \rightarrow G$ and $\text{COV}\{g_1(\theta_o^*)\} = \sigma^2 V_*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n \text{COV}(\mathcal{Y}_{ni}) &= n \text{COV}(\mathcal{Y}_{n1}) = \text{COV}\{A_n V_*^{-1/2}g_1(\theta_o^*)\} \\
&= A_n V_*^{-1/2} \text{COV}\{g_1(\theta_o^*)\} (V_*^{-1/2})^\top A_n^\top \\
&= \sigma^2 A_n V_*^{-1/2} V_* (V_*^{-1/2})^\top A_n^\top \\
&= \sigma^2 A_n A_n^\top \rightarrow \sigma^2 G.
\end{aligned}$$

These facts imply that \mathcal{Y}_{ni} satisfies the Lindeberg–Feller conditions. Therefore, we obtain that $n^{-1/2}A_n V_*^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta_o^*)$ converges in distribution to a multivariate normal random variable with mean 0_q and covariance matrix $\sigma^2 G$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Define $\mathcal{A}_n = V_n(\widehat{\theta}_1) + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\widehat{\theta}_1)$, $\mathcal{A} = V(\theta_o^*) + \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\theta_o^*)$, $\mathcal{B}_n = V_n(\widehat{\theta}_1)$ and $\mathcal{B} = V(\theta_o^*)$. Then, we can write $n(\widehat{\Xi}_n - \Xi)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} n(\widehat{\Xi}_n - \Xi) &= \widehat{\sigma}^2 \mathcal{A}_n^{-1} \mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{A}_n^{-1} - \sigma^2 \mathcal{A}^{-1} \mathcal{B} \mathcal{A}^{-1} \\ &= \widehat{\sigma}^2 \mathcal{A}_n^{-1} (\mathcal{B}_n - \mathcal{B}) \mathcal{A}_n^{-1} + (\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2) \mathcal{A}_n^{-1} \mathcal{B} \mathcal{A}_n^{-1} \\ &\quad + \sigma^2 (\mathcal{A}_n^{-1} - \mathcal{A}^{-1}) \mathcal{B} \mathcal{A}_n^{-1} + \sigma^2 \mathcal{A}^{-1} \mathcal{B} (\mathcal{A}_n^{-1} - \mathcal{A}^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.31})$$

and $\mathcal{A}_n^{-1} - \mathcal{A}^{-1}$ as

$$\mathcal{A}_n^{-1} - \mathcal{A}^{-1} = \mathcal{A}_n^{-1} (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}_n) \mathcal{A}^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.32})$$

Denote $\text{eig}_i(A)$ as the i th largest eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix A . In what follows, we show

$$\text{eig}_i[n(\widehat{\Xi}_n - \Xi)] = o_p(1), \quad (\text{A.33})$$

which indicates that $\widehat{\Xi}_n$ is a consistent estimator of Ξ . Note that $|\text{eig}_i(\mathcal{A})|$ and $|\text{eig}_i(\mathcal{B})|$ are infinite and uniformly bounded away from 0. Thus, in view of (A.31) and (A.32), to prove (A.33), we need to demonstrate that $\text{eig}_i(\mathcal{A}_n - \mathcal{A}) = o_p(1)$, $\text{eig}_i(\mathcal{B}_n - \mathcal{B}) = o_p(1)$ and $\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2 = o_p(1)$.

We first show

$$\text{eig}_i(\mathcal{A}_n - \mathcal{A}) = o_p(1). \quad (\text{A.34})$$

We consider the following decomposition

$$\mathcal{A}_n - \mathcal{A} = \underbrace{V_n(\widehat{\theta}_1) - V(\theta_o^*)}_{I_9} + \underbrace{\Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\widehat{\theta}_1) - \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\theta_o^*)}_{I_{10}}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \text{eig}_{\min}(I_9) + \text{eig}_{\min}(I_{10}) &\leq \text{eig}_{\min}(I_9 + I_{10}) \\ &\leq \text{eig}_{\max}(I_9 + I_{10}) \leq \text{eig}_{\max}(I_9) + \text{eig}_{\max}(I_{10}), \end{aligned}$$

we can consider $\text{eig}_i(I_9)$ and $\text{eig}_i(I_{10})$ separately. For I_9 , since $\text{eig}_i^2(I_9) \leq \text{eig}_{\max}^2(I_9) \leq \|I_9\|_{\text{F}}^2$,

it suffices to show

$$\|I_9\|_{\text{F}} = o_p(1). \quad (\text{A.35})$$

Note that

$$I_9 = V_n(\widehat{\theta}_1) - V(\theta_o^*) = \underbrace{V_n(\widehat{\theta}_1) - V_n(\theta_o^*)}_{I_{91}} + \underbrace{V_n(\theta_o^*) - V(\theta_o^*)}_{I_{92}}.$$

Using the arguments similar to the proof of (A.13) in Theorem 1, we can show

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_{91}\|_{\text{F}}^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^{s_n^*} \sum_{k=1}^{s_n^*} \{V_{nj,k}(\widehat{\theta}_1) - V_{nj,k}(\theta_o^*)\}^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{s_n^*} \sum_{k=1}^{s_n^*} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{s_n^*} \frac{\partial V_{nj,k}(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_{ol}} (\widehat{\theta}_{1l} - \theta_{ol}^*) \right\}^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{s_n^*} \sum_{k=1}^{s_n^*} \sum_{l=1}^{s_n^*} \left\{ \frac{\partial V_{nj,k}(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_{ol}} \right\}^2 \|\widehat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\|^2 \\ &= O_p\left(\frac{s_n^4 M_n^4}{n}\right) + o_p\left(\frac{s_n^4}{n}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\check{\theta}_o$ lies between $\widehat{\theta}_1$ and θ_o^* . Thus, if $s_n^8/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\|I_{91}\|_{\text{F}}^2 = O_p(s_n^4 M_n^4/n) = o_p(1). \quad (\text{A.36})$$

For I_{92} , by Lemma 1 in Section B, we obtain $\|I_{92}\|_{\mathbb{F}} = o_p(1)$. This, together with (A.36), implies (A.35).

In addition, by condition 6 and the fact that $\|\widehat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\| = O_p(\sqrt{s_n/n})$, we can show

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_{10}\|_{\mathbb{F}} &= \|\Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\widehat{\theta}_1) - \Sigma_{\lambda_n}(\theta_o^*)\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\leq \kappa_2 \|\widehat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\| = O_p(\sqrt{s_n/n}) = o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.37})$$

Therefore, by (A.35) and (A.37), we obtain (A.34). Similarly, we can show that $\|\mathcal{B}_n - \mathcal{B}\|_{\mathbb{F}} = \|V_n(\widehat{\theta}_1) - V(\theta_o^*)\|_{\mathbb{F}} = o_p(1)$, which implies

$$\text{eig}_i(\mathcal{B}_n - \mathcal{B}) = o_p(1). \quad (\text{A.38})$$

Next, we show

$$\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2 = o_p(1). \quad (\text{A.39})$$

By the definitions of $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ and σ^2 , we can write

$$\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2 = \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{T_{ni}^2(\widehat{\theta}_1) - T_{ni}^2(\theta_o^*)\}}_{I_{11}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_{ni}^2(\theta_o^*) - \mathbb{E}T_i^2(\theta_o^*)}_{I_{12}},$$

where $T_{ni}(\widehat{\theta}_1)$ and $T_i(\theta_o^*)$ are defined in the proof of Theorem 1. For I_{11} , by the Taylor expansion and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$I_{11}^2 = \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{s_n^*} \frac{\partial T_{ni}^2(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_{oj}} (\widehat{\theta}_{1j} - \theta_{oj}^*) \right\}^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{s_n^*} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial T_{ni}^2(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_{oj}} \right\}^2 \|\widehat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\|^2,$$

where $\check{\theta}_o$ lies between $\widehat{\theta}_1$ and θ_o^* . Using the arguments similar to the proof of (A.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{11}^2 &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{s_n^*} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial T_{ni}^2(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_{oj}} \right\}^2 \|\widehat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\|^2 \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^{s_n^*} \left(\mathbb{E} \frac{\partial T_1^2(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{oj}} \right)^2 \|\widehat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\|^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{s_n^*} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial T_{ni}^2(\check{\theta}_o)}{\partial \theta_{oj}} - \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial T_1^2(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{oj}} \right) \right\}^2 \|\widehat{\theta}_1 - \theta_o^*\|^2 \\
&\leq O_p\left(\frac{s_n^2}{n}\right) + o_p\left(\frac{s_n^2}{n}\right) = o_p(1)
\end{aligned} \tag{A.40}$$

with $s_n^2/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For I_{12} , by (A.5), (A.6) and conditions 1-4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbb{E}T_{ni}^2(\theta_o^*) - \mathbb{E}T_i^2(\theta_o^*)| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\epsilon_i - \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* \left\{ q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) \right\} \right]^2 - \mathbb{E} \epsilon_i^2 \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* \left\{ q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) \right\} \right]^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\epsilon_i \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* \left\{ q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) \right\} \right] \right| \\
&\leq C_1^2 \delta_n^2 \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \sum_{k=1}^{M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*| |\alpha_k^*| \times \mathbb{P}(|X_i^\top \beta^* - \tau_m^*| \leq \delta_n, |X_i^\top \beta^* - \tau_k^*| \leq \delta_n) \\
&\leq C_1^2 M_n \delta_n^3 \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*|^2 F'(w_m) = O(M_n \delta_n^3).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{V}\text{AR} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_{ni}^2(\theta_o^*) \right\} &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{V}\text{AR} \left\{ \epsilon_i - \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* \left(q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) \right) \right\}^2 \\
&\leq \frac{8}{n} \mathbb{E}(\epsilon_i^4) + \frac{8}{n} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* \left(q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) \right) \right\}^4 \\
&\leq \frac{8}{n} \mathbb{E}(\epsilon_i^4) + \frac{8C_1^4 M_n \delta_n^5}{n} \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*|^4 F'(w_m) = O(1/n) + O(M_n \delta_n^5/n).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $s_n \delta_n^3 \rightarrow 0$ and $s_n \delta_n^5/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, using the Chebyshev's inequality yields

$I_{12} = o_p(1)$, which, together with (A.40), implies that (A.39) holds. By (A.34), (A.38) and (A.39), we obtain (A.33). This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

A.4 Proof of Theorem 4

With a slight abuse of notation, let $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\alpha}_0, \hat{\beta}_2, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{d_1}, \hat{\eta}^\top)^\top$ and $\theta^* = (\alpha_0^*, \beta_2^*, \dots, \beta_{d_1}^*, \eta^{*\top})^\top$, where $\hat{\alpha}_0, \hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\eta}$ are obtained using (5). By the Taylor expansion of $\psi(\tau_0, \hat{\alpha}_0, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta})$ at θ^* , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\tau_0, \hat{\alpha}_0, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n q_n(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}, \tau_0) (Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \hat{\eta} - \hat{\alpha}_0 X_i^\top \hat{\beta}) \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0) (Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^*)}_{I_{13}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_{ni}(\tau_0)^\top \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)}_{I_{14}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^\top \frac{\partial^2 \psi_i(\tau_0, \check{\theta})}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^\top} (\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)}_{I_{15}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\check{\theta}$ lies between $\hat{\theta}$ and θ^* , $\psi_i(\tau_0, \theta) = q_n(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_0) (Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta - \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta)$ and $D_{ni}(\tau_0) = (D_{ni,1}(\tau_0), \dots, D_{ni,d}(\tau_0))^\top$ with

$$D_{ni,j}(\tau_0) = \begin{cases} -X_i^\top \beta^* q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0), & \text{if } j = 1, \\ -\alpha_0^* X_{i,j} q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0) + \frac{\partial q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0)}{\partial \beta_j} (Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^*), & \text{if } 2 \leq j \leq d_1, \\ -\tilde{Z}_{i,j-d_1-1} q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0), & \text{if } d_1 + 1 \leq j \leq d. \end{cases}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{13} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \{q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0)\} (Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^*) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0) (Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^*). \end{aligned}$$

Under H_{1n} , using some arguments similar to the proof of (A.8), we can show

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left| \{q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0)\} (Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^*) \right| \\ &\leq C_1 \delta_n \mathbb{E} \left| I(\tau_0 - \delta_n \leq X_i^\top \beta^* \leq \tau_0 + \delta_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \varpi_m f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) + \epsilon_i \right\} \right| \\ &\leq O(M_n^* \delta_n^2 / \sqrt{n}) + O(\delta_n^2). \end{aligned}$$

This, together with $s_n^2/n \rightarrow 0$ and $\sqrt{n}\delta_n^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, implies

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \{q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0)\} (Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^*) = O_p(\sqrt{n}\delta_n^2) = o_p(1).$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$I_{13} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0) (Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^*) + o_p(1). \quad (\text{A.41})$$

For I_{14} , by the condition $s_n^2/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and the definition of $\hat{\theta}$, we have

$$I_{14} = -D(\tau_0)^\top \Omega^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i (Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^*) + o_p(1). \quad (\text{A.42})$$

Under conditions 1-4, using (A.5) and (A.6), we can show that for any θ satisfying $\|\theta - \theta^*\| = O(1/\sqrt{n})$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \psi_i(\tau_0, \theta)}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k} \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \psi_i(\tau_0, \theta^*)}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k} \right) + o(1), \\ &\text{and } \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{A}\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \psi_i(\tau_0, \theta)}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k} \right) \leq O\left(\frac{1}{n\delta_n}\right) + O\left(\frac{s_n^2}{n^2\delta_n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $s_n^2/n \rightarrow 0$ and $1/(n\delta_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, using the Chebyshev's inequality, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_{15}\|^2 &\leq 2n\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|^4 \sum_{j,k} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \psi_i(\tau_0, \check{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k} - \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial^2 \psi_1(\tau_0, \theta^*)}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k} \right\}^2 \\ &\quad + 2n\|\hat{\theta} - \theta^*\|^4 \sum_{j,k} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial^2 \psi_1(\tau_0, \theta^*)}{\partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k} \right\}^2 \\ &= O_p(1/n) = o_p(1). \end{aligned} \tag{A.43}$$

Combining (A.41)-(A.43), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\tau_0, \hat{\alpha}_0, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\eta}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \{f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0) - D(\tau_0)^\top \Omega^{-1} \xi_i\} (Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^*) + o_p(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{*i}(\tau_0) + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, it can be shown that the class $\{\psi_{*i}(\tau_0) : \tau_0 \in \Theta_\tau\}$ is P-Donsker. Therefore, $n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{*i}(\tau_0) / \sqrt{\varrho(\tau_0)}$ converges weakly to a Gaussian process with mean function $\Delta(\tau_0) = \mathbb{E}[\{f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_0) - D(\tau_0)^\top \Omega^{-1} \xi\} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \varpi_m f(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_m^*)] / \sqrt{\varrho(\tau_0)}$ and covariance function $\Gamma(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \mathbb{C}\text{OV}(\psi_*(\tau_1), \psi_*(\tau_2)) / \sqrt{\varrho(\tau_1)\varrho(\tau_2)}$ where $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \Theta_\tau$. Finally, we can show that the variance estimator $\hat{\varrho}(\tau_0)$ converges in probability to $\varrho(\tau_0)$ uniformly in $\tau_0 \in \Theta_\tau$ under both the null and the local alternative hypotheses. Therefore, Theorem 4 holds and the proof is complete.

B Proof of Lemmas and (A.8)

B.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Lemma 1. *If $s_n^4/(n\delta_n) \rightarrow 0$ and $s_n^4\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, then we have*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_o \partial \theta_o^\top} - V(\theta_o^*) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} = o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_n}}\right), \quad (\text{B.1})$$

and

$$\|V_n(\theta_o^*) - V(\theta_o^*)\|_{\mathbb{F}} = o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_n}}\right). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Proof. For any given $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_o \partial \theta_o^\top} - V(\theta_o^*) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{s_n}}\right) \\ & \leq \frac{s_n}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{j=1}^{s_n^*} \sum_{k=1}^{s_n^*} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok}} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok}} + \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok}} - V_{j,k}(\theta_o^*) \right\}^2 \\ & \leq \underbrace{\frac{4s_n}{\varepsilon^2 n} \sum_{j=1}^{s_n^*} \sum_{k=1}^{s_n^*} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\partial g_{ni,j}(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{ok}} - V_{j,k}(\theta_o^*) \right\}^2}_{I_{16}} + \underbrace{\frac{4s_n}{\varepsilon^2 n} \sum_{j=1}^{s_n^*} \sum_{k=1}^{s_n^*} \mathbb{E} \left\{ V_{j,k}(\theta_o^*) \right\}^2}_{I_{17}} \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\frac{2s_n}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{j=1}^{s_n^*} \sum_{k=1}^{s_n^*} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{oj} \partial \theta_{ok}} - V_{j,k}(\theta_o^*) \right\}^2}_{I_{18}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we show that $I_{16} = O(s_n^3 M_n / (n\delta_n))$, $I_{17} = O(s_n^3/n)$ and $I_{18} = O(s_n^3 M_n^4 \delta_n^2)$. It suffices to show that the terms in the summations of I_{16} , I_{17} and I_{18} have the order of $O(M_n/\delta_n)$, $O(1)$ and $O(M_n^4 \delta_n^2)$, respectively. For I_{16} and I_{18} , we show that the statements hold for the terms with $j, k = 2(M_n^* + 1)$, and the statements for other terms can be obtained similarly. Note

that for $j, k = 2(M_n^* + 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\partial g_{ni,j}(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{ok}} - V_{j,k}(\theta_o^*) \right\} \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(\alpha_0^* X_{i,2} + \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* \frac{\partial q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*)}{\partial \beta_2} \right)^2 - \left(\alpha_0^* X_{i,2} + \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* X_{i,2} I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_m^*) \right)^2 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \sum_{l=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_l^* \frac{\partial^2 q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_l^*)}{\partial \beta_2^2} \left(Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^* - \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) \right) \right\} \right| \\
&\leq \left| 2\mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_0^* \alpha_l^* X_{i,2} \left(\frac{\partial q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_l^*)}{\partial \beta_2} - X_{i,2} I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_l^*) \right) \right\} \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \sum_{l=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_l^* \alpha_m^* \left(\frac{\partial q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*)}{\partial \beta_2} + X_{i,2} I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_m^*) \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_l^*)}{\partial \beta_2} - X_{i,2} I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_l^*) \right) \right\} \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_l^* \frac{\partial^2 q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_l^*)}{\partial \beta_2^2} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) - \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) - \epsilon_i \right) \right\} \right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

By (A.5) and (A.6), the first term on the right hand side of (B.3) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \left\{ 2\alpha_0^* X_{i,2} \sum_{l=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_l^* \left(\frac{\partial q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_l^*)}{\partial \beta_2} - X_{i,2} I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_l^*) \right) \right\} \right| \\
&\leq 2|\alpha_0^*| \sum_{l=1}^{M_n^*} |\alpha_l^*| \mathbb{E} \{ X_{i,2}^2 I(\tau_l^* - \delta_n \leq X_i^\top \beta^* \leq \tau_l^* + \delta_n) / 2 \} \\
&\leq |\alpha_0^*| \sum_{l=1}^{M_n^*} |\alpha_l^*| \int_{\tau_l^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_l^* + \delta_n} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x_2^2 dF(x_2|w) dF(w) \\
&\leq 2|\alpha_0^*| \sum_{l=1}^{M_n^*} |\alpha_l^*| \mathbb{E}(X_{i,2}^2 | X_i^\top \beta^* = w_l) F'(w_l) \delta_n = O(M_n \delta_n),
\end{aligned}$$

where w_l is between $\tau_l^* - \delta_n$ and $\tau_l^* + \delta_n$. Similarly, we can show that the second and the third terms of (B.3) are $O(M_n^2 \delta_n)$. This implies

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\partial g_{ni,j}(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{ok}} - V_{j,k}(\theta_o^*) \right\} \right| = O(M_n^2 \delta_n).$$

In addition, by some the arguments similar to the proof of (B.3) , we can show

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\partial g_{ni,j}(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_{ok}} - V_{j,k}(\theta_o^*) \right\}^2 \leq O(M_n/\delta_n). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

These facts imply $I_{16} = O(s_n^3 M_n / (n \delta_n))$ and $I_{18} = O(s_n^3 M_n^4 \delta_n^2)$.

For I_{17} , we show that $|V_{j,k}(\theta_o^*)|$ ($j = 2M_n^* + 2$, $k = 2M_n^* + d_1 + 2$) is bounded away from infinite. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_0^* + \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_m^*) &= \sum_{m=0}^{M_n^*} \mu_m^* I(\tau_m^* < X_i^\top \beta^* \leq \tau_{m+1}^*), \\ \text{and } \sum_{m=0}^{M_n^*} I(\tau_m^* < X_i^\top \beta^* \leq \tau_{m+1}^*) &= 1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where $\mu_m^* = \sum_{k=0}^m \alpha_k^*$ and μ_m^* ($0 \leq m \leq M_n^*$) are bounded under condition 2. By (B.5), condition 1 and the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality, we can show that for $j = 2M_n^* + 2$ and $k = 2M_n^* + d_1 + 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |V_{j,k}(\theta_o^*)| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[Z_{i,1} X_{i,2} \left\{ \alpha_0^* + \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_m^*) \right\} \right] \right| \\ &\leq \left| \mathbb{E} \left\{ Z_{i,1} X_{i,2} \sum_{m=0}^{M_n^*} \mu_m^* I(\tau_m^* < X_i^\top \beta^* \leq \tau_{m+1}^*) \right\} \right| \\ &\leq \max_{0 \leq m \leq M_n^*} |\mu_m^*| \mathbb{E} \left\{ |Z_{i,1} X_{i,2}| \sum_{m=0}^{M_n^*} I(\tau_m^* < X_i^\top \beta^* \leq \tau_{m+1}^*) \right\} \\ &\leq \max_{0 \leq m \leq M_n^*} |\mu_m^*| (\mathbb{E} Z_{i,1}^2)^{1/2} (\mathbb{E} X_{i,2}^2)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded above by conditions 2 and 3. Similarly, we can show that $|V_{j,k}(\theta_o^*)|$ ($j \neq 2M_n^* + 2$, $k \neq 2M_n^* + d_1 + 2$) is also bounded away from infinite. These facts imply $I_{17} = O(s_n^3/n)$. If $s_n^4/(n\delta_n) \rightarrow 0$ and $s_n^4\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}_n(\theta_o^*)}{\partial \theta_o \partial \theta_o^\top} - V(\theta_o^*) \right\|_{\text{F}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{s_n}} \right) \leq O\left(\frac{s_n^3 M_n}{n \delta_n}\right) + O\left(\frac{s_n^3}{n}\right) + O(s_n^3 M_n^4 \delta_n^2) \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence, we obtain that (B.1) holds. Similarly, we can prove (B.2). This completes the proof of Lemma 1. \square

B.2 Proof of (A.8)

Proof. The proof of (A.8) is based on (A.5) and (A.6). For $M_n^* + 1 \leq j \leq 2M_n^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\{|g_{ni,j}(\theta_o^*) - g_{i,j}(\theta_o^*)|\} \\
& \leq |\alpha_{j-M_n^*}^*| \mathbb{E}\left\{\left| \left(Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^* \right) \left(I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_{j-M_n^*}^*) + \frac{\partial q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_{j-M_n^*}^*)}{\partial \tau_{j-M_n^*}^*} \right) \right|\right\} \\
& \quad + |\alpha_{j-M_n^*}^*| \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*| \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \mathbb{E}\left\{\left| I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_{j-M_n^*}^*) f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m) \right.\right. \\
& \quad \quad \quad \left. \left. + \frac{\partial q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_{j-M_n^*}^*)}{\partial \tau_{j-M_n^*}^*} q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m) \right|\right\}. \tag{B.6}
\end{aligned}$$

By (A.5), (A.6) and conditions 1-5, the first term on the right hand of (B.6) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\alpha_{j-M_n^*}^*| \mathbb{E}\left\{\left| \left(Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^* \right) \left(I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_{j-M_n^*}^*) + \frac{\partial q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_{j-M_n^*}^*)}{\partial \tau_{j-M_n^*}^*} \right) \right|\right\} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} |\alpha_{j-M_n^*}^*| \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*| \sum_{m=1}^{j-M_n^*-1} |\tau_{j-M_n^*}^* - \tau_m^*| \int_{\tau_{j-M_n^*}^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_{j-M_n^*}^* + \delta_n} dF(w) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} |\alpha_{j-M_n^*}^*| |\alpha_j^*| \int_{\tau_{j-M_n^*}^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_{j-M_n^*}^* + \delta_n} |w - \tau_{j-M_n^*}^*| dF(w) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} |\alpha_{j-M_n^*}^*| \times \int_{\tau_{j-M_n^*}^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_{j-M_n^*}^* + \delta_n} \mathbb{E}(|\epsilon_i| | W_i = w) dF(w) \\
& = O(M_n \delta_n) + O(\delta_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the second term on the right hand side of (B.6) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \alpha_{j-M_n^*}^* \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*| \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left| I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_{j-M_n^*}) f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m) + \frac{\partial q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_{j-M_n^*})}{\partial \tau_{j-M_n^*}} q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m) \right| \right\} \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} |\alpha_{j-M_n^*}^*| \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*| \sum_{m=1}^{j-M_n^*-1} |\tau_{j-M_n^*}^* - \tau_m^*| \int_{\tau_{j-M_n^*}^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_{j-M_n^*}^* + \delta_n} dF(w) \\
& \quad + \frac{C_1 \delta_n}{2} |\alpha_{j-M_n^*}^*| \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*| \int_{\tau_{j-M_n^*}^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_{j-M_n^*}^* + \delta_n} dF(w) \\
& \quad + \frac{C_1 \delta_n}{2} |\alpha_{j-M_n^*}^*| \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*| \sum_{m=j-M_n^*+1}^{M_n^*} \int_{\tau_m^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_m^* + \delta_n} dF(w) \\
& = O(M_n \delta_n) + O(\delta_n^2) + O(M_n \delta_n^2).
\end{aligned}$$

For $j = 2M_n^* + 1$, by (A.5), (A.6) and conditions 2 and 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \{ |g_{ni,j}(\theta_o^*) - g_{i,j}(\theta_o^*)| \} & = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left| X_i^\top \beta^* \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* \left(q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) \right) \right| \right\} \\
& \leq C_1 \delta_n \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*| \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \int_{\tau_m^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_m^* + \delta_n} |w| dF(w) \\
& = O(M_n \delta_n^2).
\end{aligned}$$

For $2M_n^* + 2 \leq j \leq 2M_n^* + d_1$, a straightforward calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \{ |g_{ni,j}(\theta_o^*) - g_{i,j}(\theta_o^*)| \} \\
& \leq \underbrace{\sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \mathbb{E} \left\{ |\alpha_0^* X_{i,j-2M_n^*} (q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*))| \right\}}_{I_{19}} \\
& \quad + \underbrace{\sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \sum_{k=1}^{M_n^*} |\alpha_m^* \alpha_k^*| \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left| q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_k^*) \frac{\partial q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*)}{\partial \beta_{j-2M_n^*}} - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_k^*) X_{i,j-2M_n^*} I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_m^*) \right| \right\}}_{I_{20}} \\
& \quad + \underbrace{\sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*| \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left| \left(Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta^* - \alpha_0^* X_i^\top \beta^* \right) \left(\frac{\partial q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*)}{\partial \beta_{j-2M_n^*}} - X_{i,j-2M_n^*} I(X_i^\top \beta^* > \tau_m^*) \right) \right| \right\}}_{I_{21}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we show that $I_{19} = O(M_n \delta_n^2)$, $I_{20} = O(M_n^2 \delta_n)$, and $I_{21} = O(M_n^2 \delta_n)$. For I_{19} , by (A.5),

(A.6) and conditions 1-3, we have

$$I_{19} \leq C_1 \delta_n |\alpha_0^*| \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \int_{\tau_m^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_m^* + \delta_n} \mathbb{E}(|X_{i,j-2M_n^*}| | W_i = w) dF(w) = O(M_n \delta_n^2).$$

Similarly, we can show

$$\begin{aligned} I_{20} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} |\alpha_m^* \alpha_k^*| \times |\tau_m^* - \tau_k^*| \int_{\tau_m^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_m^* + \delta_n} \mathbb{E}(|X_{i,j-2M_n^*}| | W_i = w) dF(w) \\ &\quad + \frac{C_1 \delta_n}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*|^2 \int_{\tau_m^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_m^* + \delta_n} \mathbb{E}(|X_{i,j-2M_n^*}| | W_i = w) dF(w) \\ &\quad + C_1 \delta_n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \sum_{k=m+1}^{M_n^*} |\alpha_m^* \alpha_k^*| \int_{\tau_k^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_k^* + \delta_n} \mathbb{E}(|X_{i,j-2M_n^*}| | W_i = w) dF(w) \\ &= O(M_n^2 \delta_n) + O(M_n \delta_n^2) + O(M_n^2 \delta_n), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I_{21} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} |\alpha_m^* \alpha_k^*| \times |\tau_m^* - \tau_k^*| \int_{\tau_m^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_m^* + \delta_n} \mathbb{E}(|X_{i,j-2M_n^*}| | W_i = w) dF(w) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*|^2 \int_{\tau_m^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_m^* + \delta_n} \mathbb{E}(|X_{i,j-2M_n^*}| | W_i = w) |w - \tau_m^*| dF(w) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*| \int_{\tau_m^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_m^* + \delta_n} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x_{j-2M_n^*}| \mathbb{E}(|\epsilon_i| | X_{i,j-2M_n^*} = x_{j-2M_n^*}, W_i = w) dF(x_{j-2M_n^*}, w) \\ &= O(M_n^2 \delta_n) + O(M_n \delta_n) + O(\delta_n). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the results of I_{19} , I_{20} and I_{21} , we have that for $2M_n^* + 2 \leq j \leq 2M_n^* + d_1$,

$$\mathbb{E}\{|g_{ni,j}(\theta_o^*) - g_{i,j}(\theta_o^*)|\} \leq O(M_n^2 \delta_n).$$

For $2M_n^* + d_1 + 1 \leq j \leq 2M_n^* + d$, by (A.5), (A.6) and conditions 2 and 3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\{|g_{ni,j}(\theta_o^*) - g_{i,j}(\theta_o^*)|\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left\{\left|\tilde{Z}_{i,j-2M_n^*-d_1-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* (q_n(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*) - f(X_i^\top \beta^*, \tau_m^*))\right|\right\} \\
&\leq \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n^*} |\alpha_m^*| (\mathbb{E} \tilde{Z}_{i,j-2M_n^*-d_1-1}^2)^{1/2} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \left\{ \int_{\tau_m^* - \delta_n}^{\tau_m^* + \delta_n} (q_n(w, \tau_m^*) - f(w, \tau_m^*))^2 dF(w) \right\}^{1/2} \\
&= O(M_n \delta_n^{3/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

These facts imply that (A.8) also holds for $2M_n^* + 1 \leq j \leq 2M_n^* + d$. \square

C An iterative algorithm for solving problem (4)

In this section, we develop an iterative procedure to obtain $\hat{\theta}$. For simplicity, let $\alpha = \alpha(M_n)$, $\tau = \tau(M_n)$ and $\theta = \theta(M_n)$. Define

$$h_n(\eta, \beta, \alpha, \tau) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i - \tilde{Z}_i^\top \eta - \alpha_0 X_i^\top \beta - \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} \alpha_m q_n(X_i^\top \beta, \tau_m) \right\}^2.$$

Let $\theta^{[k]} = ((\alpha_{(-0)}^{[k]})^\top, (\tau^{[k]})^\top, \alpha_0^{[k]}, (\beta_{(-1)}^{[k]})^\top, (\eta^{[k]})^\top)^\top$ be the estimate of θ at the k th iteration.

Then, the proposed iterative procedure is summarized in Algorithm 1.

The problems (C.2) and (C.3) in Algorithm 1 can be efficiently solved using the Matlab function *fmincon*. Next, we consider to minimize (C.1). Note that minimizing problem (C.1) is equivalent to minimize the following the constraint optimization problem:

$$h_n(\eta, \beta^{[k]}, \alpha, \tau^{[k]}) + n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} p_{\lambda_n, t}(|\zeta_m|)$$

$$\text{subject to } \alpha_m - \zeta_m = 0, \quad m = 1, \dots, M_n,$$

Algorithm 1 : An iterative procedure to minimize (4)

Input: $\beta^{[0]}$, $\tau^{[0]}$, $k = 0$, an integer K and a tolerance parameter ε_1 .

Step 1. Update $\eta^{[k+1]}$ and $\alpha^{[k+1]}$ by

$$(\alpha^{[k+1]}, \eta^{[k+1]}) = \arg \min_{(\alpha^\top, \eta^\top)^\top} h_n(\eta, \beta^{[k]}, \alpha, \tau^{[k]}) + n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} p_{\lambda_n, t}(|\alpha_m|). \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Step 2. Update $\tau^{[k+1]}$ by

$$\tau_m^{[k+1]} = \tilde{\tau}_m^{[k+1]} I(\alpha_m^{[k+1]} \neq 0) + \tau_\infty I(\alpha_m^{[k+1]} = 0) \quad (m = 1, \dots, M_n),$$

where

$$\tilde{\tau}^{[k+1]} = \arg \min_{\tau} h_n(\eta^{[k+1]}, \beta^{[k]}, \alpha^{[k+1]}, \tau). \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Step 3. Update $\beta^{[k+1]}$ by

$$\beta^{[k+1]} = \arg \min_{\beta} h_n(\eta^{[k+1]}, \beta, \alpha^{[k+1]}, \tau^{[k+1]}). \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Step 4. Let $\theta^{[k+1]} = ((\alpha_{(-0)}^{[k+1]})^\top, (\tau^{[k+1]})^\top, \alpha_0^{[k+1]}, (\beta_{(-1)}^{[k+1]})^\top, (\eta^{[k+1]})^\top)^\top$ and $k = k + 1$. Repeat

Steps 1-3 until $\|\theta^{[k]} - \theta^{[k-1]}\| < \varepsilon_1$ or $k > K$.

Output: $\hat{\theta} = \theta^{[k]}$.

where $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{M_n})^\top$. By the augmented Lagrangian method, we can estimate η , α and ζ by minimizing

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\eta, \alpha, \zeta, v) = & h_n(\eta, \beta^{[k]}, \alpha, \tau^{[k]}) + n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} p_{\lambda_n, t}(|\zeta_m|) \\ & + n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} v_m(\alpha_m - \zeta_m) + \frac{n\vartheta}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} (\alpha_m - \zeta_m)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

where $v = (v_1, \dots, v_{M_n})^\top$ with v_m ($m = 1, \dots, M_n$) being the Lagrange multipliers and ϑ is a penalty parameter.

Let $\mathbb{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^\top$, $\mathbb{Z} = (\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_n)^\top$ and $\mathbb{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)^\top$. Define $\mathbb{Q}(\beta, \tau) = (\mathbb{X}\beta, q_n(\mathbb{X}\beta, \tau_1), \dots, q_n(\mathbb{X}\beta, \tau_{M_n}))$. To solve problem (C.4), we utilize the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM), which iteratively updates the estimates of α , η , ζ , and v . Define $\alpha^{[k+1, l]}$, $\eta^{[k+1, l]}$, $\zeta^{[k+1, l]}$ and $v^{[k+1, l]}$ as the estimates of α , η , ζ and v at the l th iteration. The algorithm proceeds as follows.

First, for each given $\eta = \eta^{[k+1, l]}$, $\zeta = \zeta^{[k+1, l]}$ and $v = v^{[k+1, l]}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}(\eta^{[k+1, l]}, \alpha, \zeta^{[k+1, l]}, v^{[k+1, l]}) \\ = & \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbb{Y} - \mathbb{Z}\eta^{[k+1, l]} - \mathbb{Q}^{[k]}\alpha \right\|^2 + \frac{n\vartheta}{2} \left\| \alpha_{(-0)} - \zeta^{[k+1, l]} + \vartheta^{-1}v^{[k+1, l]} \right\|^2 + C, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{Q}^{[k]} = \mathbb{Q}(\beta^{[k]}, \tau^{[k]})$ and C is a constant independent of α . Thus, by solving the equation

$$\partial \mathcal{L}(\eta^{[k+1, l]}, \alpha, \zeta^{[k+1, l]}, v^{[k+1, l]}) / \partial \alpha = 0,$$

we obtain an updating form of α as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{[k+1, l+1]} = & \left\{ (\mathbb{Q}^{[k]})^\top \mathbb{Q}^{[k]} + n\vartheta \mathbb{I}_{M_n+1} \right\}^{-1} \times \\ & \left\{ (\mathbb{Q}^{[k]})^\top (\mathbb{Y} - \mathbb{Z}\eta^{[k+1, l]}) + n(\vartheta \bar{\zeta}^{[k+1, l]} - \bar{v}^{[k+1, l]}) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

where $\mathbb{I}_{M_n+1} = \text{diag}\{0, 1, \dots, 1\}$ is an $(M_n + 1) \times (M_n + 1)$ diagonal matrix, $\bar{\zeta}^{[k+1,l]} = (0, (\zeta^{[k+1,l]})^\top)^\top$ and $\bar{v}^{[k+1,l]} = (0, (v^{[k+1,l]})^\top)^\top$.

In the second step, by some arguments similar to (C.5), for each given $\alpha = \alpha^{[k+1,l+1]}$, $\zeta = \zeta^{[k+1,l]}$ and $v = v^{[k+1,l]}$ in $\mathcal{L}(\eta, \alpha, \zeta, v)$, we can update η by

$$\eta^{[k+1,l+1]} = (\mathbb{Z}^\top \mathbb{Z})^{-1} \mathbb{Z}^\top (\mathbb{Y} - \mathbb{Q}^{[k]} \alpha^{[k+1,l+1]}). \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Third, we update ζ . By (C.4), we observe that for given $\eta = \eta^{[k+1,l+1]}$, $\alpha = \alpha^{[k+1,l+1]}$ and $v = v^{[k+1,l]}$, it suffices to minimize

$$\begin{aligned} & n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} v_m^{[k+1,l]} (\alpha_m^{[k+1,l+1]} - \zeta_m) + \frac{n\vartheta}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} (\alpha_m^{[k+1,l+1]} - \zeta_m)^2 + n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} p_{\lambda_n, t}(|\zeta_m|) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} \frac{n\vartheta}{2} (u_m^{[k+1,l+1]} - \zeta_m)^2 + n \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} p_{\lambda_n, t}(|\zeta_m|), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

where $u_m^{[k+1,l+1]} = \alpha_m^{[k+1,l+1]} + \vartheta^{-1} v_m^{[k+1,l]}$. For the MCP penalty with $t > 1/\vartheta$, by minimizing

(C.7), we have

$$\zeta_m^{[k+1,l+1]} = \begin{cases} \frac{\text{ST}(u_m^{[k+1,l+1]}, \lambda_n/\vartheta)}{1-1/(t\vartheta)} & \text{if } |u_m^{[k+1,l+1]}| \leq t\lambda_n, \\ u_m^{[k+1,l+1]} & \text{if } |u_m^{[k+1,l+1]}| > t\lambda_n, \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

where $\text{ST}(x, \lambda_n) = \text{sign}(x)(|x| - \lambda_n)_+$ is the soft thresholding rule, and $(x)_+ = \max\{x, 0\}$.

For the SCAD penalty with $t > 1/\vartheta + 1$, it is

$$\zeta_m^{[k+1,l+1]} = \begin{cases} \text{ST}(u_m^{[k+1,l+1]}, \lambda_n/\vartheta) & \text{if } |u_m^{[k+1,l+1]}| \leq \lambda_n(1 + 1/\vartheta), \\ \frac{\text{ST}(u_m^{[k+1,l+1]}, t\lambda_n/((t-1)\vartheta))}{1-1/((t-1)\vartheta)} & \text{if } \lambda_n(1 + 1/\vartheta) < |u_m^{[k+1,l+1]}| \leq t\lambda_n, \\ u_m^{[k+1,l+1]} & \text{if } |u_m^{[k+1,l+1]}| > t\lambda_n. \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

Finally, we update v by

$$v^{[k+1,l+1]} = v^{[k+1,l]} + \vartheta(\alpha_{(-0)}^{[k+1,l+1]} - \zeta^{[k+1,l+1]}). \quad (\text{C.10})$$

The ADMM algorithm to solve (C.1) are summarized in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 : Alternating Mirection Method of Dultipliers Algorithm (ADMM algorithm)

Input: $\alpha^{[k+1,0]} = \alpha^{[k]}$, $\eta^{[k+1,0]} = \eta^{[k]}$, $l = 0$, a positive integer L and a tolerance parameter ε_2 .

Step 2.1. Calculate $\alpha^{[k+1,l+1]}$ by (C.5);

Step 2.2. Calculate $\eta^{[k+1,l+1]}$ by (C.6);

Step 2.3. Calculate $\zeta^{[k+1,l+1]}$ by (C.8) and (C.9) for MCP and SCAD, respectively;

Step 2.4. Calculate $v^{[k+1,l+1]}$ by (C.10);

Step 2.5. Let $l \leftarrow l + 1$. Repeat Steps 2.1-2.4 until $\|((\alpha^{[k+1,l]})^\top, (\eta^{[k+1,l]})^\top)^\top - ((\alpha^{[k+1,l-1]})^\top, (\eta^{[k+1,l-1]})^\top)^\top\| < \varepsilon_2$ or $l > L$.

Output: $\alpha^{[k+1]} = \alpha^{[k+1,l]}$ and $\eta^{[k+1]} = \eta^{[k+1,l]}$.

D Additional simulation results

Table S1: Simulation results (multiplied by 100) for Case 1 with $\alpha^* = (1, -1.5)^\top$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\epsilon_i \sim \text{Schi}^2(2)$.

n	ν		Oracle				SCAD				MCP			
			Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP
1000	0.6	α_0	-0.027	4.73	4.68	95.3	-0.010	4.73	4.64	95.6	-0.027	4.73	4.62	95.8
		α_1	0.466	7.82	8.01	93.8	0.424	7.81	8.02	93.8	0.462	7.82	7.94	94.0
		τ_1	0.364	5.57	5.78	95.2	0.336	5.57	5.72	95.4	0.357	5.57	5.70	95.3
		β_2	-0.244	4.09	4.10	94.3	-0.249	4.09	4.08	94.1	-0.237	4.09	4.08	94.2
		γ_1	0.065	3.34	3.38	94.5	0.071	3.34	3.40	94.3	0.080	3.34	3.40	94.4
	0.8	α_0	-0.078	4.73	4.68	95.4	-0.032	4.73	4.64	95.5	-0.039	4.73	4.62	95.8
		α_1	0.489	7.81	7.96	94.1	0.407	7.80	8.01	93.8	0.462	7.81	7.95	94.1
		τ_1	0.292	5.55	5.76	95.5	0.275	5.55	5.71	95.6	0.329	5.55	5.72	95.5
		β_2	-0.190	4.08	4.08	94.7	-0.229	4.09	4.07	94.3	-0.222	4.08	4.08	94.3
		γ_1	0.075	3.34	3.38	94.6	0.076	3.34	3.39	94.3	0.083	3.34	3.40	94.4
2000	0.6	α_0	-0.034	3.35	3.39	95.1	-0.029	3.35	3.37	95.1	-0.026	3.35	3.38	95.0
		α_1	-0.033	5.53	5.54	94.8	-0.053	5.53	5.56	94.5	-0.048	5.53	5.54	94.4
		τ_1	-0.087	3.94	4.11	94.0	-0.098	3.95	4.13	93.8	-0.088	3.95	4.11	94.0
		β_2	-0.078	2.89	2.94	95.0	-0.083	2.89	2.92	94.8	-0.084	2.89	2.93	94.8
		γ_1	-0.080	2.37	2.45	93.8	-0.081	2.37	2.44	94.0	-0.079	2.37	2.45	93.9
	0.8	α_0	-0.060	3.35	3.38	95.2	-0.042	3.35	3.37	95.1	-0.045	3.35	3.38	95.0
		α_1	-0.023	5.52	5.52	94.8	-0.056	5.52	5.56	94.6	-0.028	5.52	5.54	94.5
		τ_1	-0.127	3.94	4.11	93.9	-0.132	3.94	4.14	93.9	-0.097	3.94	4.12	93.9
		β_2	-0.050	2.89	2.93	95.1	-0.067	2.89	2.92	94.9	-0.068	2.89	2.93	94.8
		γ_1	-0.075	2.37	2.45	93.8	-0.075	2.37	2.44	94.0	-0.079	2.37	2.45	94.0

Table S2: Simulation results (multiplied by 100) for Case 1 with $\alpha^* = (1, -1.5)^\top$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\epsilon_i \sim t(4)$.

n	ν		Oracle				SCAD				MCP			
			Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP
1000	0.6	α_0	0.373	6.69	6.99	94.4	0.478	6.69	6.96	94.2	0.415	6.68	7.00	94.3
		α_1	-0.165	11.0	11.2	95.3	-0.326	11.0	11.2	94.9	-0.214	11.0	11.2	95.0
		τ_1	0.275	7.92	8.29	93.7	0.265	7.93	8.30	93.9	0.295	7.92	8.29	93.9
		β_2	-0.653	5.86	6.16	94.5	-0.767	5.88	6.13	94.4	-0.711	5.87	6.17	94.1
		γ_1	-0.098	4.71	4.72	95.2	-0.096	4.71	4.74	95.0	-0.122	4.71	4.72	95.2
	0.8	α_0	0.323	6.68	6.94	94.7	0.451	6.68	6.92	94.5	0.412	6.68	6.98	94.6
		α_1	-0.144	11.0	11.1	95.3	-0.329	11.0	11.1	95.1	-0.204	11.0	11.1	95.1
		τ_1	0.197	7.90	8.23	94.0	0.196	7.91	8.35	93.5	0.299	7.91	8.28	93.9
		β_2	-0.595	5.85	6.10	94.7	-0.732	5.87	6.10	94.5	-0.699	5.86	6.15	94.2
		γ_1	-0.089	4.71	4.71	95.2	-0.089	4.71	4.74	95.2	-0.105	4.71	4.73	95.1
2000	0.6	α_0	-0.091	4.75	4.93	94.3	-0.087	4.75	4.91	94.3	-0.089	4.75	4.94	94.3
		α_1	0.078	7.83	8.19	94.5	0.052	7.83	8.10	94.8	0.065	7.83	8.18	94.7
		τ_1	0.148	5.59	5.53	95.2	0.125	5.59	5.49	95.4	0.137	5.59	5.52	95.1
		β_2	-0.124	4.11	4.31	94.3	-0.126	4.11	4.28	94.4	-0.122	4.11	4.31	94.1
		γ_1	-0.024	3.35	3.33	95.0	-0.030	3.35	3.33	94.8	-0.030	3.35	3.33	94.9
	0.8	α_0	-0.117	4.75	4.92	94.2	-0.092	4.75	4.91	94.6	-0.102	4.75	4.92	94.4
		α_1	0.083	7.82	8.16	94.0	0.034	7.82	8.12	94.5	0.088	7.82	8.14	94.4
		τ_1	0.100	5.58	5.52	95.1	0.088	5.58	5.53	94.8	0.140	5.58	5.51	94.8
		β_2	-0.096	4.10	4.30	94.1	-0.117	4.10	4.28	94.1	-0.108	4.10	4.29	94.1
		γ_1	-0.019	3.35	3.33	95.0	-0.027	3.35	3.33	95.1	-0.026	3.35	3.33	95.0

Table S3: Simulation results (multiplied by 100) for Case 2 with $\nu = 0.8$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

n		Oracle				SCAD				MCP			
		Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP
1000	α_0	0.237	4.12	4.11	94.7	0.145	4.13	4.16	94.1	0.115	4.13	4.18	94.0
	α_1	-0.786	12.1	12.2	95.3	-0.538	12.1	12.8	94.8	-0.424	12.1	12.9	94.3
	α_2	1.256	13.6	13.9	94.4	0.974	13.6	14.2	94.0	0.971	13.6	14.2	93.9
	τ_1	0.011	6.59	6.62	94.9	-0.180	6.60	6.94	93.8	-0.240	6.60	7.01	93.5
	τ_2	0.226	8.51	8.70	94.7	0.343	8.53	9.32	93.4	0.496	8.54	9.45	92.5
	β_2	0.103	3.25	3.33	93.8	0.016	3.26	3.40	93.3	-0.019	3.26	3.42	93.2
	γ_1	-0.130	3.32	3.24	95.3	-0.130	3.32	3.25	95.2	-0.129	3.32	3.25	95.3
2000	α_0	-0.062	2.90	2.86	95.9	-0.082	2.90	2.85	95.7	-0.101	2.90	2.85	95.8
	α_1	-0.370	8.53	8.82	93.8	-0.345	8.53	8.99	93.6	-0.216	8.52	9.02	93.7
	α_2	0.645	9.54	9.90	94.0	0.562	9.54	9.95	94.0	0.504	9.54	9.97	93.9
	τ_1	0.043	4.65	4.77	94.5	0.012	4.65	4.81	94.4	-0.050	4.66	4.84	94.3
	τ_2	0.231	6.00	6.21	93.0	0.211	6.01	6.41	92.9	0.325	6.01	6.44	92.8
	β_2	-0.071	2.29	2.40	93.3	-0.090	2.30	2.41	93.3	-0.107	2.30	2.41	93.0
	γ_1	-0.082	2.34	2.31	95.8	-0.080	2.34	2.31	95.7	-0.080	2.34	2.31	95.7

Table S4: Simulation results (multiplied by 100) for Case 2 with $\alpha^* = (1, -2, 2)^\top$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\epsilon_i \sim \text{Schi}^2(2)$.

n	ν		Oracle				SCAD				MCP			
			Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP
1000	0.6	α_0	0.034	4.10	4.32	92.6	-0.016	4.10	4.33	92.6	0.001	4.10	4.35	92.4
		α_1	-1.590	12.2	13.0	93.0	-1.566	12.2	13.2	92.6	-1.543	12.2	13.1	93.2
		α_2	2.118	13.6	13.9	94.1	1.997	13.6	14.0	93.6	1.991	13.6	13.9	94.1
		τ_1	0.349	6.58	6.99	93.0	0.290	6.59	7.07	93.0	0.298	6.59	6.99	93.6
		τ_2	-0.278	8.51	8.97	93.2	-0.362	8.51	9.15	92.5	-0.303	8.51	9.20	92.4
		β_2	-0.109	3.24	3.40	93.5	-0.142	3.25	3.42	93.2	-0.140	3.25	3.43	93.1
		γ_1	0.105	3.31	3.34	95.2	0.110	3.31	3.30	95.4	0.117	3.31	3.32	95.3
	0.8	α_0	0.047	4.10	4.30	92.6	-0.028	4.09	4.32	92.8	-0.016	4.09	4.34	92.3
		α_1	-1.417	12.1	12.6	93.2	-1.504	12.1	13.1	93.0	-1.423	12.1	13.0	93.2
		α_2	2.023	13.6	13.7	94.0	1.912	13.6	14.0	93.8	1.902	13.6	13.8	94.0
		τ_1	0.308	6.56	6.83	93.5	0.257	6.56	7.03	93.2	0.244	6.56	6.99	93.2
		τ_2	-0.141	8.46	8.61	94.3	-0.364	8.46	9.13	92.6	-0.227	8.46	9.22	92.2
		β_2	-0.092	3.23	3.35	94.0	-0.153	3.24	3.41	93.7	-0.155	3.24	3.42	93.5
		γ_1	0.101	3.31	3.34	95.2	0.112	3.31	3.30	95.4	0.111	3.31	3.31	95.4
2000	0.6	α_0	0.060	2.91	3.06	93.6	0.055	2.91	3.06	93.5	0.031	2.91	3.06	93.7
		α_1	-0.547	8.58	9.11	93.2	-0.595	8.59	9.25	93.0	-0.490	8.58	9.32	92.6
		α_2	0.662	9.57	9.79	94.3	0.641	9.57	9.88	93.9	0.587	9.57	9.90	94.0
		τ_1	0.062	4.67	4.80	94.1	0.068	4.67	4.86	93.6	0.015	4.67	4.89	93.6
		τ_2	-0.102	6.03	6.57	92.8	-0.179	6.03	6.68	92.3	-0.087	6.04	6.72	92.3
		β_2	-0.045	2.30	2.45	93.2	-0.050	2.30	2.44	93.4	-0.069	2.30	2.44	93.4
		γ_1	0.142	2.35	2.21	96.3	0.145	2.35	2.21	96.4	0.146	2.35	2.21	96.4
	0.8	α_0	0.070	2.91	3.06	93.2	0.048	2.91	3.06	93.3	0.032	2.91	3.06	93.5
		α_1	-0.467	8.55	8.92	93.4	-0.577	8.56	9.22	93.0	-0.430	8.55	9.20	92.5
		α_2	0.628	9.55	9.73	94.4	0.587	9.56	9.84	94.3	0.541	9.55	9.85	93.8

Table S5: Simulation results (multiplied by 100) for Case 2 with $\alpha^* = (1, -2, 2)^\top$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\epsilon_i \sim t(4)$.

n	ν		Oracle				SCAD				MCP			
			Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP
1000	0.6	α_0	-0.097	5.82	6.15	93.1	-0.152	5.82	6.20	92.7	-0.153	5.78	6.24	92.1
		α_1	-2.133	17.4	19.2	92.3	-2.252	17.4	20.1	91.7	-2.286	17.3	20.2	91.2
		α_2	3.438	19.4	21.2	93.1	3.394	19.5	21.4	92.7	3.581	19.3	21.3	92.5
		τ_1	0.083	9.38	10.4	93.3	-0.029	9.40	10.7	92.6	0.003	9.33	10.7	92.2
		τ_2	0.185	12.1	13.1	93.2	-0.006	12.1	13.8	91.9	0.216	12.1	13.7	91.3
		β_2	-0.153	4.63	4.89	94.2	-0.203	4.63	4.97	93.9	-0.218	4.60	4.97	93.8
		γ_1	0.199	4.69	4.76	94.3	0.153	4.69	4.69	94.3	0.187	4.67	4.69	94.2
	0.8	α_0	-0.070	5.81	6.09	92.9	-0.173	5.81	6.20	92.6	-0.170	5.77	6.24	92.4
		α_1	-1.929	17.3	18.5	92.5	-2.015	17.3	20.0	91.8	-2.100	17.2	20.2	90.9
		α_2	3.239	19.4	20.9	93.0	3.121	19.4	21.3	92.7	3.400	19.3	21.3	92.5
		τ_1	0.051	9.34	10.1	93.8	-0.168	9.37	10.6	92.9	-0.118	9.30	10.6	92.4
		τ_2	0.225	12.1	12.6	93.8	0.021	12.1	13.8	91.7	0.284	12.0	13.9	90.9
		β_2	-0.115	4.61	4.83	94.3	-0.200	4.62	4.96	93.8	-0.225	4.59	4.97	93.8
		γ_1	0.197	4.69	4.75	94.3	0.164	4.69	4.69	94.5	0.189	4.67	4.66	94.3
2000	0.6	α_0	0.016	4.12	4.13	95.1	0.023	4.12	4.19	94.5	-0.002	4.12	4.18	94.5
		α_1	-0.851	12.2	12.4	94.1	-1.009	12.2	12.9	92.9	-0.825	12.2	12.9	92.9
		α_2	1.085	13.6	13.8	94.5	1.148	13.6	13.8	94.3	1.048	13.6	14.0	94.2
		τ_1	0.088	6.60	6.69	94.9	0.114	6.60	6.86	94.1	0.038	6.61	6.88	94.2
		τ_2	0.005	8.55	9.23	93.2	-0.122	8.55	9.76	91.7	0.045	8.56	9.72	91.6
		β_2	-0.019	3.26	3.38	93.5	-0.021	3.26	3.44	93.3	-0.039	3.26	3.42	92.6
		γ_1	0.073	3.32	3.41	94.5	0.078	3.32	3.40	94.6	0.077	3.32	3.41	94.5
	0.8	α_0	0.031	4.12	4.11	95.3	0.014	4.12	4.18	95.0	-0.019	4.12	4.18	94.4
		α_1	-0.807	12.1	12.1	94.0	-0.941	12.1	12.8	93.0	-0.707	12.1	12.8	93.0
		α_2	1.034	13.6	13.6	94.5	1.033	13.6	13.8	94.1	0.951	13.6	13.9	93.6

Table S6: Simulation results (multiplied by 100) for Case 3 with $\nu = 0.8$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

n		Oracle				SCAD				MCP			
		Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP
1000	α_0	0.072	3.04	3.18	94.0	0.035	3.04	3.19	94.0	0.028	3.04	3.19	93.9
	α_1	0.873	16.2	17.3	93.3	1.808	16.4	17.4	93.4	1.894	16.4	17.3	93.4
	α_2	-1.156	15.7	16.7	93.8	-1.632	15.8	16.9	93.6	-1.708	15.8	16.8	93.6
	α_3	-1.192	15.8	16.6	93.6	-0.118	15.6	17.0	93.3	-0.152	15.6	17.0	93.3
	α_4	1.600	18.3	19.0	93.4	0.324	18.2	19.5	93.1	0.374	18.2	19.4	93.1
	τ_1	-0.618	12.5	13.0	93.1	-0.279	12.5	13.1	93.0	-0.224	12.5	13.0	93.2
	τ_2	-0.297	11.2	11.9	93.1	-1.122	11.2	11.8	92.9	-1.156	11.2	11.8	92.8
	τ_3	0.956	11.3	11.8	93.3	-0.412	11.3	12.6	92.1	-0.427	11.3	12.6	92.2
	τ_4	0.581	13.5	14.2	93.2	1.155	13.6	14.4	93.2	1.119	13.6	14.4	93.1
	β_2	-0.251	5.07	5.32	93.9	-0.229	5.07	5.34	94.1	-0.213	5.07	5.34	94.0
γ_1	-0.216	3.46	3.56	95.0	-0.215	3.46	3.54	95.1	-0.216	3.46	3.54	95.0	
2000	α_0	0.030	2.15	2.17	94.2	-0.009	2.15	2.16	94.3	-0.014	2.15	2.16	94.2
	α_1	-0.252	11.4	11.6	93.6	0.403	11.5	11.7	94.1	0.487	11.5	11.6	94.1
	α_2	0.106	11.0	11.2	94.2	-0.241	11.1	11.2	94.1	-0.317	11.1	11.2	94.1
	α_3	-0.604	11.1	11.4	94.0	0.093	11.0	11.6	93.5	0.029	11.0	11.6	93.5
	α_4	0.860	12.9	13.4	94.5	0.035	12.8	13.7	94.1	0.103	12.8	13.7	94.0
	τ_1	-0.538	8.84	8.88	93.6	-0.256	8.83	8.89	93.8	-0.214	8.83	8.87	93.8
	τ_2	0.285	7.93	8.15	93.9	-0.238	7.94	8.11	94.0	-0.279	7.94	8.10	94.2
	τ_3	0.296	7.93	8.25	94.2	-0.602	7.93	8.61	92.6	-0.589	7.93	8.60	92.5
	τ_4	0.201	9.56	9.94	93.3	0.494	9.57	9.97	93.3	0.457	9.57	9.97	93.2
	β_2	-0.168	3.58	3.61	94.7	-0.123	3.58	3.59	95.0	-0.112	3.58	3.59	95.1
γ_1	-0.032	2.45	2.47	93.7	-0.033	2.45	2.46	93.6	-0.032	2.45	2.46	93.6	

Table S7: Simulation results (multiplied by 100) for Case 3 with $\nu = 0.6$, $\alpha^* = (-1, 3, -2, -2, 3)^\top$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\epsilon_i \sim \text{Schi}^2(2)$.

n		Oracle				SCAD				MCP			
		Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP
1000	α_0	0.286	3.03	3.16	93.9	0.285	3.03	3.21	93.1	0.278	3.03	3.20	93.1
	α_1	0.697	16.3	17.3	93.3	1.053	16.3	17.4	93.2	1.020	16.3	17.4	93.2
	α_2	-1.292	15.7	16.5	94.0	-1.475	15.8	16.6	93.7	-1.440	15.8	16.6	93.7
	α_3	-1.020	15.9	17.5	92.2	-0.340	15.8	17.8	91.9	-0.324	15.8	17.8	91.8
	α_4	1.273	18.4	19.5	94.0	0.646	18.3	19.9	93.6	0.618	18.3	19.9	93.8
	τ_1	-0.940	12.5	13.0	94.3	-0.862	12.5	13.3	93.7	-0.853	12.5	13.3	93.7
	τ_2	-0.193	11.3	12.9	91.5	-0.585	11.3	12.9	91.3	-0.542	11.3	12.9	91.1
	τ_3	1.019	11.3	11.9	92.3	0.435	11.3	12.2	91.7	0.428	11.3	12.1	91.8
	τ_4	1.058	13.6	14.9	92.0	1.563	13.6	15.3	91.3	1.540	13.6	15.3	91.6
	β_2	-0.481	5.07	5.34	93.9	-0.508	5.08	5.44	93.2	-0.498	5.08	5.43	93.3
γ_1	0.064	3.45	3.49	95.3	0.061	3.45	3.47	95.4	0.062	3.45	3.47	95.4	
2000	α_0	0.074	2.16	2.21	94.6	0.048	2.16	2.22	94.6	0.047	2.16	2.22	94.5
	α_1	0.522	11.5	11.7	94.2	0.884	11.5	11.9	93.9	0.902	11.5	11.9	93.8
	α_2	-0.779	11.1	11.4	94.3	-1.008	11.1	11.5	94.2	-1.018	11.1	11.5	94.1
	α_3	-0.403	11.1	12.2	92.2	-0.129	11.1	12.3	92.0	-0.134	11.1	12.3	91.9
	α_4	0.408	12.9	13.8	92.5	0.121	12.9	13.9	92.4	0.116	12.9	13.9	92.5
	τ_1	-0.427	8.85	8.93	94.9	-0.253	8.84	9.05	94.8	-0.248	8.84	9.05	94.7
	τ_2	-0.324	7.96	8.84	92.4	-0.537	7.96	8.87	92.5	-0.560	7.96	8.85	92.5
	τ_3	0.547	7.97	8.52	92.9	0.180	7.97	8.63	92.8	0.176	7.97	8.62	92.8
	τ_4	0.340	9.59	10.1	93.9	0.444	9.60	10.2	93.7	0.447	9.60	10.2	93.7
	β_2	-0.217	3.59	3.74	94.3	-0.184	3.59	3.76	94.6	-0.185	3.59	3.76	94.5
γ_1	-0.105	2.45	2.47	94.9	-0.108	2.45	2.47	94.9	-0.108	2.45	2.47	94.9	

Table S8: Simulation results (multiplied by 100) for Case 3 with $\nu = 0.8$, $\alpha^* = (-1, 3, -2, -2, 3)^\top$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\epsilon_i \sim \text{Schi}^2(2)$.

n		Oracle				SCAD				MCP			
		Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP
1000	α_0	0.277	3.03	3.14	93.9	0.297	3.03	3.20	93.1	0.289	3.03	3.20	93.4
	α_1	0.466	16.2	16.7	93.6	0.834	16.2	17.2	93.7	0.885	16.2	17.2	93.5
	α_2	-1.068	15.6	16.2	94.0	-1.220	15.7	16.5	93.6	-1.254	15.7	16.5	93.7
	α_3	-0.842	15.8	17.0	93.0	0.206	15.6	17.7	91.8	0.214	15.6	17.7	91.6
	α_4	1.156	18.3	19.2	94.2	0.151	18.2	19.9	93.5	0.138	18.2	19.9	93.4
	τ_1	-0.957	12.5	12.9	94.3	-0.966	12.5	13.3	93.7	-0.926	12.5	13.2	94.1
	τ_2	-0.060	11.2	12.6	91.9	-0.558	11.2	12.8	91.1	-0.571	11.2	12.8	91.2
	τ_3	0.975	11.2	11.6	93.2	0.082	11.2	12.1	92.0	0.065	11.2	12.1	92.2
	τ_4	1.057	13.5	14.6	92.6	1.844	13.6	15.3	91.2	1.841	13.6	15.3	91.3
	β_2	-0.452	5.06	5.30	93.9	-0.525	5.07	5.44	93.1	-0.515	5.07	5.43	93.3
	γ_1	0.063	3.45	3.49	95.3	0.056	3.45	3.49	95.2	0.056	3.45	3.49	95.2
2000	α_0	0.079	2.15	2.19	94.6	0.055	2.15	2.22	94.5	0.051	2.15	2.22	94.6
	α_1	0.371	11.4	11.5	95.0	0.830	11.5	11.8	94.2	0.861	11.5	11.8	94.4
	α_2	-0.645	11.1	11.2	94.4	-0.920	11.1	11.4	94.3	-0.937	11.1	11.4	94.5
	α_3	-0.342	11.1	12.0	92.4	0.171	11.0	12.3	91.8	0.147	11.0	12.2	91.8
	α_4	0.363	12.9	13.7	92.7	-0.179	12.8	13.9	92.4	-0.172	12.8	13.9	92.4
	τ_1	-0.479	8.83	8.82	95.1	-0.297	8.83	9.05	94.4	-0.276	8.83	9.04	94.6
	τ_2	-0.261	7.94	8.76	92.5	-0.584	7.94	8.80	92.2	-0.604	7.94	8.81	92.4
	τ_3	0.556	7.95	8.38	92.9	-0.023	7.95	8.61	92.6	-0.033	7.95	8.61	92.6
	τ_4	0.359	9.57	10.0	94.4	0.612	9.58	10.2	93.9	0.589	9.58	10.2	93.6
	β_2	-0.220	3.58	3.71	94.5	-0.200	3.58	3.77	94.1	-0.192	3.58	3.77	94.1
	γ_1	-0.106	2.45	2.47	94.9	-0.107	2.45	2.47	94.9	-0.107	2.45	2.47	94.9

Table S9: Simulation results (multiplied by 100) for Case 3 with $\nu = 0.6$, $\alpha^* = (-1, 3, -2, -2, 3)^\top$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\epsilon_i \sim t(4)$.

n	ν	Oracle				SCAD				MCP			
		Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP
1000	α_0	0.095	4.29	4.38	95.4	0.104	4.29	4.43	95.1	0.085	4.29	4.42	94.9
	α_1	2.647	23.3	25.3	91.8	3.535	23.5	25.6	91.8	3.707	23.5	25.5	91.8
	α_2	-2.741	22.6	25.0	91.5	-3.040	22.8	25.2	92.0	-3.191	22.8	25.1	92.0
	α_3	-3.172	22.7	24.4	92.7	-1.635	22.4	24.4	92.4	-1.774	22.4	24.4	92.4
	α_4	4.188	26.3	28.1	93.3	2.227	26.0	28.1	92.8	2.401	26.0	28.1	92.7
	τ_1	-0.648	17.7	18.6	93.1	-0.535	17.7	19.0	93.0	-0.411	17.7	18.8	93.1
	τ_2	-0.894	16.0	17.2	92.5	-2.033	16.0	17.7	92.3	-2.087	16.0	17.6	92.2
	τ_3	1.071	16.0	17.0	91.7	-0.905	16.0	18.2	90.0	-0.868	16.0	18.2	90.0
	τ_4	0.965	19.2	20.0	94.4	1.845	19.3	20.4	94.0	1.755	19.3	20.3	94.0
	β_2	-0.553	7.17	7.32	95.0	-0.598	7.19	7.46	94.7	-0.564	7.18	7.43	94.7
γ_1	-0.023	4.88	4.99	94.6	-0.017	4.88	4.99	94.6	-0.017	4.88	4.99	94.6	
2000	α_0	-0.044	3.04	3.17	93.4	-0.047	3.04	3.18	93.5	-0.060	3.04	3.17	93.8
	α_1	1.270	16.3	16.6	94.1	1.809	16.4	16.7	94.0	1.985	16.4	16.7	93.9
	α_2	-1.136	15.8	16.3	93.7	-1.403	15.9	16.4	93.9	-1.548	15.9	16.4	93.9
	α_3	-1.065	15.7	16.8	92.6	-0.496	15.6	17.0	92.5	-0.583	15.6	16.9	92.4
	α_4	1.499	18.2	18.7	93.3	0.788	18.2	18.9	93.6	0.850	18.2	18.8	93.8
	τ_1	-0.061	12.5	12.6	94.0	0.065	12.5	12.8	94.2	0.152	12.5	12.8	94.3
	τ_2	-0.249	11.3	12.7	91.9	-0.841	11.3	12.4	92.6	-0.925	11.3	12.4	92.5
	τ_3	-0.208	11.3	11.8	93.7	-0.972	11.2	12.2	92.3	-0.967	11.2	12.2	92.3
	τ_4	0.344	13.5	14.2	93.2	0.694	13.6	14.4	92.8	0.626	13.5	14.4	92.8
	β_2	-0.116	5.06	5.29	94.1	-0.122	5.06	5.33	94.0	-0.102	5.06	5.31	94.0
γ_1	-0.065	3.46	3.50	94.7	-0.065	3.46	3.50	94.8	-0.064	3.46	3.49	94.8	

Table S10: Simulation results (multiplied by 100) for Case 3 with $\nu = 0.8$, $\alpha^* = (-1, 3, -2, -2, 3)^\top$, $C_n = \log\{\log(n)\}$ and $\epsilon_i \sim t(4)$.

n	ν	Oracle				SCAD				MCP			
		Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP	Bias	SE	SD	CP
1000	α_0	0.086	4.28	4.35	95.3	0.117	4.29	4.40	95.1	0.085	4.29	4.39	95.2
	α_1	2.123	23.1	24.5	92.5	3.283	23.4	25.3	92.2	3.614	23.4	25.1	92.1
	α_2	-2.257	22.4	24.4	92.2	-2.761	22.7	24.8	92.4	-3.020	22.7	24.8	92.4
	α_3	-2.765	22.6	23.1	93.0	-1.171	22.2	24.1	92.4	-1.325	22.2	24.0	92.4
	α_4	3.856	26.1	27.2	93.7	1.807	25.9	27.9	92.7	1.964	25.9	27.8	92.7
	τ_1	-0.706	17.6	18.3	93.5	-0.632	17.7	18.8	93.2	-0.425	17.6	18.7	93.3
	τ_2	-0.579	15.9	16.7	93.4	-2.040	16.0	17.5	92.2	-2.166	16.0	17.4	92.3
	τ_3	1.006	15.9	16.4	92.8	-1.136	15.9	18.1	90.1	-1.193	15.9	18.1	90.1
	τ_4	0.950	19.1	19.6	94.8	2.099	19.2	20.3	93.8	1.964	19.2	20.3	93.8
	β_2	-0.515	7.16	7.24	94.9	-0.614	7.18	7.44	94.3	-0.559	7.17	7.40	94.4
γ_1	-0.024	4.88	4.99	94.7	-0.018	4.88	5.00	94.7	-0.020	4.88	5.00	94.7	
2000	α_0	-0.051	3.04	3.12	93.7	-0.032	3.04	3.17	93.8	-0.047	3.04	3.16	93.7
	α_1	0.986	16.2	16.1	94.6	1.741	16.4	16.5	94.1	1.901	16.4	16.4	94.2
	α_2	-0.884	15.7	16.0	94.3	-1.274	15.8	16.2	93.9	-1.406	15.9	16.2	94.1
	α_3	-0.973	15.7	16.5	93.3	-0.062	15.5	16.9	92.8	-0.141	15.6	16.8	92.9
	α_4	1.440	18.2	18.5	93.7	0.333	18.1	18.8	93.4	0.399	18.1	18.7	93.8
	τ_1	-0.087	12.5	12.4	94.5	0.001	12.5	12.7	94.6	0.095	12.5	12.6	94.4
	τ_2	-0.039	11.2	12.4	92.7	-0.954	11.3	12.3	92.2	-1.015	11.2	12.3	92.0
	τ_3	-0.209	11.2	11.5	94.3	-1.268	11.2	12.2	91.9	-1.273	11.2	12.2	91.9
	τ_4	0.285	13.5	13.9	93.7	0.952	13.5	14.3	93.1	0.880	13.5	14.3	93.1
	β_2	-0.091	5.05	5.22	94.6	-0.153	5.06	5.30	94.2	-0.129	5.06	5.28	94.2
γ_1	-0.065	3.46	3.50	94.6	-0.066	3.46	3.51	94.7	-0.066	3.46	3.51	94.7	




Figure S1: The curves of $\varphi(w) = \alpha_0 w + \sum_{m=1}^{M_n^*} \alpha_m^* f(w, \tau_m^*)$ under different settings